DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 041 JC 920 417

AUTHOR	Lombardi, John; Cohen, Arthur M., Ed.
TITLE	Perspectives on the Community College: Essays.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Los Angeles, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-87117-240-2
PUB DATE	92
CONTRACT	RI88062002
NOTE	210p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Department PCC, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, DC 20036 ($24.95).
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses - ERIC Clearinghouse Products (071) -- Books (010)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; Anthologies; *College Administration; College Curriculum; *College Faculty; College Transfer Students; *Community Colleges; Community Services; Continuing Education; *Educational Finance; Part Time Faculty; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

ABSTRACT

The essays in this collection were written by John Lombardi during the 1970s while he was a resident scholar at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. Following a foreword on Lombardi's life and work by a son and two daughters, John V., Mary Luciana, and Janice P. Lombardi, is an introduction by Arthur M. Cohen giving highlights of Lombardi's approach to his work and summarizing the introductory comments state that the 10 essays presented in this book, all of which were chosen for their relevance to issues facing contemporary community college leaders and students aspiring to leadership positions. The first essay, "Riding the Wave of New Enrollments" discusses the periodic increases and declines in two-year college enrollment and the ways that college leaders attempt to sustain the enrollments on which their funding is based. "Critical Decade for Community College Financing" provides an analysis of the perennial issues in sustaining college finances and offers a review of the feasibility of stratagems for maintaining a constant flow of dollars into the institution. Three essays respectively entitled "Faculty Workload," "The Ambiguity of the Part-Time Faculty," and "Role of the Department Chairman in Improving Instruction" address key aspects of managing faculty. The next four essays, "A New Look at Vocational Education," "Four Phases of Developmental Education," "The Decline of Transfer Education," and "The Two-Year College Student and Community Services," analyze central areas of the community college curriculum. The last essay, "Student Activism," looks at the effects on and responses to activism on college campuses. Finally, Arthur M. Cohen offers a summary and update of trends in each area addressed by Lombardi in a concluding chapter entitled "A Contemporary View of the Issues." A comprehensive bibliography of Lombardi's writings is included. (MAB)

041

PERSPECTIVES
ON THE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

essays by John Lombardi

edited by Arthur M. Cohen

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. J. Murray

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

JC 920417

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

American Council on Education

American Association for Community and Junior Colleges

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Copyright © 1992 by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the American Council on Education.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the Publisher.

American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

Printed in the United States of America

printing number
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

ISBN 0-87117-240-2

Additional copies of this publication may be purchased from the American Council on Education for $24.95 postpaid. All orders must be prepaid by money order or check (made payable to the American Council on Education) and sent to:

Publications Department PCC
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

This publication was produced on a Macintosh II computer using Microsoft Word 4.0 and Aldus PageMaker 4.01 software.

CONTENTS

Foreword *v*
John Lombardi, Mary Luciana Lombardi, and Janice P. Lombardi

Introduction *xi*
Arthur M Cohen

1 RIDING THE WAVE OF NEW ENROLLMENTS *1*

2 CRITICAL DECADE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCING *29*

3 FACULTY WORKLOAD *39*

4 THE AMBIGUITY OF THE PART-TIME FACULTY *51*

5 ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN IN IMPROVING INSTRUCTION *69*

6 A NEW LOOK AT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION *79*

7 FOUR PHASES OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION *89*

8 THE DECLINE OF TRANSFER EDUCATION *99*

9 THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE STUDENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES *119*

10 STUDENT ACTIVISM *129*

11 A CONTEMPORARY VIEW OF THE ISSUES
(Summary and Update by Arthur M. Cohen) *151*

Comprehensive Lombardi Bibliography *186*

Index *195*

Foreword

JOHN LOMBARDI AND THE WRITTEN WORD

Each of us builds lives out of the circumstances of our times and the qualities of mind and spirit we can bring to the task. Sometimes the elements of time, place, opportunity, and character combine to produce an exemplary life that stands as a model of accomplishment, integrity, and values, a life whose visible career achievements accurately reflect private values. John Lombardi lived such a life. Born into the complex, rich, and difficult life of the Italian immigrant neighborhoods of Brooklyn at the beginning of this century, his commitment to family and friends and his fundamental belief in the power of education carried him through a succession of jobs and education to a doctorate in history at Columbia University. When we asked, "Why history?" he replied, "Because that's what we could do in night classes." Fascinated by many topics, he harbored an enthusiasm for mathematics, political thought, and Spanish, and a respect for vocational skills that endured throughout his life. Such an eclectic appreciation for learning served him well in his early instructional career as an instructor at Los Angeles City College where he taught a wide range of subjects including beginning Spanish, math, English, political science, and, of course, history.

But it was Los Angeles City College and the community college movement of which it was a part that captured his imagination and creativity. Over the decades of his involvement with that college, John Lombardi served in almost every academic capacity from beginning instructor to dean of the evening division and then president of the independent Los Angeles City College. This odyssey through the creation and invention of a major community college gave him a perspective and a commitment to the values and the mission of the community college that informed all of his published pieces on this subject.

His own experience gave him an empathy for those pursuing a quality education while balancing jobs and family responsibilities. From observation and experience he acquired a strong commitment to the concept that education should be available to those who can benefit, without charge and without any obstacle other than a willingness to learn and to study. From a life involved with family, in Brooklyn and in California, he carried an unshakeable sense of obligation for the support and encouragement of all of us. Never able to romanticize the hardships of the past, he devoted his time and energies to helping invent, nurture, and enhance institutions that served students seeking opportunity through education.

Fascinated by and respectful of the printed word, John Lombardi believed in writing with a consistency and intensity that often puzzled his contemporaries and friends. From the first moment, he published articles, beginning as best we can determine with a piece on the cathedrals of Europe. He wrote about archives in California, about the labor movement, and about the press, but from 1944 to 1980 he wrote about community colleges. For John Lombardi, the commitment to achievement required the tangible representation of the written word. In an academic world at some distance from the publish or perish ethic of the university, he sought every opportunity to put his experiences and observations on paper, published, and made available to his colleagues. He read everything, news magazines, professional journals, *The New Yorker*, *The Atlantic*, *The New Republic*, the working papers of The Fund for the Republic, pamphlets, books, and newspapers. And as he read, he would find a quote, an item of data, an idea or a concept, each copied to a scrap of paper, later to reappear as the inspiration for another paper, an illustration of an important concept, or the text for a talk.

Sometimes it appeared that he wrote because of the challenge of it. "Nothing," he would say, "is harder than writing." Although he wrote one substantial historical monograph, Labor's Voice in the Cabinet, he thought books were too hard to do, and so he wrote article after article, chapters, presentations for conventions and meetings, little speeches for graduations or capping ceremonies, a prolific output that dwarfs what most university scholars can produce in a lifetime of research and writing. Throughout all these words, painstakingly written and revised in long hand, retyped and revised again and again until they said it just as he wanted, runs a unifying thread of values and themes.

The materials in this collection reflect his work after he left City College and completed his assignment for the Los Angeles Community College District. At UCLA's ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges he found an ideal environment to continue his enthusiasm for the community college through the research and writing that formed such a continuing part of his life. The themes reflected in this collection have an antecedent in an article, a speech, a presentation at a professional meeting, or one of the ten annual State of the College presentations he prepared for the opening faculty meeting at LACC. Reading through those ten State of the College papers after reviewing the work published under the auspices of the Clearinghouse, each theme researched in depth and published in those later years can be traced back to an issue, a challenge, or an opportunity that faced the City College community and appeared in one or another of the annual reports to the faculty of LACC.

Throughout John Lombardi's career he focused his energy on problem solving and consensus building about community colleges. Because the community college represented a non-standard higher education institution, many within and outside the college worried about its definition. He wrote articles with titles "Is the Place of the Junior College Assured?" to help define the legitimate role and place of these remarkable institutions. He wrote many pieces on the relationship between transfer and vocational education, drawing first on the experience of LACC and then extending the range of his study to include national experiences. Some of his most widely read pieces dealt with the issues of financing the community colleges, with articles on tuition, the open door, formulas for funding colleges, and responses to financial crises. A graceful and effective administrator, John Lombardi wrote often about management issues beginning with the role and function of chairmen and the balance of faculty and administrative activities, and continuing to include the challenges of collective bargaining and the role of the college trustees.

In all of this work, whether in the State of the College Reports, the many articles in journals, or the ERIC Clearinghouse papers, John Lombardi carried through a continuing commitment to the fundamental mission of the community college. Reflected in speeches and papers—and especially in his work on black power, student unrest, the emergence of black studies, and the issues of tuition and the open door—access and opportunity provided the unifying theme and underlying passion of his community college career.

This commitment appears first, and perhaps most clearly, during his long association with Los Angeles City College, when John Lombardi thought often about the mission and philosophy of LACC and community colleges in general. Drawing on his own experiences he held firmly to the conviction expressed in his 1956 State of the College report that "the mission of the junior college is not, and never has been, to educate the few. From the inception of our college, and from the beginning of the junior college movement, the philosophy has been to educate all who are capable of profiting from the instruction we offer. . . . History abounds with illustrious men and women who, on any selective scheme now known to us, would have been rejected as exceptionally poor risks. . . . Our task, therefore, is far more difficult than that of the institutions which concentrate on the select few." Yet, with his colleagues, he worried about maintenance of high academic standards. In the 1958 State of the College report he commented, "I have taken a great deal of your time on the subject of scholarship in its various aspects because this is vital to us for our survival as a college. To neglect it is to court disintegration of our educational structure. Rationalization, no matter how carefully stated, will never compensate for shortcomings in the achievements of our students. We cannot tolerate mediocrity and the downgrading of standards."

Like other educational institutions, LACC confronted dramatic changes in the ethnic composition of its student population. Acutely sensitive to the damaging effects of discriminatory behavior, John Lombardi brought this issue to the forefront in his 1959 State of the College address. "We are in the midst of an ethnic transformation which has brought us large numbers of students comprising many races, nationalities, and religions. . . . Without refining our divisions too minutely, we know that the major ethnic groups consist of Caucasians, Negroes, and Orientals. Our faculty and staff are sympathetic, understanding, and considerate of the aspirations of these diverse, and often underprivileged groups. . . . That we have avoided segregation can be attributed to this fine spirit of service among our faculty and to the absence of prejudice."

Then, after talking about successful programs for minority students, he continued, "No doubt you are wondering why, if our record has been so good, I spend time talking about so obvious a phenomenon as ethnic diversity among our students. My primary purpose is to bring into the open a topic which is absorbing privately the attention of so many of us. I believe that a situation which is discussed openly loses much of its pretentious quality and enables us to deal with problems arising from it with understanding, intelligence, and judgement. Also, I wish to reaffirm our policy of equality of opportunity for all our students." Later in the same report he made this rare personal observation, "I believe that in time today's less privileged groups will make the same advances socially, economically, and educationally that our older immigrant groups made in a previous era. As one who participated in such a development, it would ill behoove me to believe otherwise."

By the 1963 State of the College, he wrote "The turmoil accompanying the major issue facing American society today [in reference to desegregation and affirmative action] has special significance for our college in its 35th year. On our campus one can observe in miniature some of the problems the community is experiencing, but without the stresses. Although the search for solutions to our problems parallels that of many communities, . . . for us the search requires a similar display of patience and intelligence. . . . As a college with a large proportion of Negro students, we can expect that off-campus demonstrations will concern them. Occasionally this will lead to overt action on campus. . . . Segregation and discrimination are humiliating experiences that leave deep emotional scars."

The following year in a long section on disadvantaged and low-aptitude students, he stated the problem clearly, "As a community college committed by law to universal education of high school graduates, we find ourselves in the midst of these economic, social, political dislocations besetting our community. We are involved because we have a high percentage of disadvantaged students. . . . Two questions have been asked and they are basic. Why do we spend so much time on students who seem so obviously not qualified to do college work? And how long will it be necessary to continue such programs? I think you know my answers—I have been giving them to anyone who will listen for some time. I believe we must do what we can to help the disadvantaged students for moral, as well as legal, reasons. . . . Aside from the legal responsibility, there is a growing feeling that many of the disadvantaged and low-aptitude students are such because of previous adverse social, economic, and political conditions; that our community has a responsibility to right the wrongs of the past. . . . On the second question, how long will it be necessary to continue such programs? My answer is, as long as the unfavorable conditions in our urban centers exist."

Access to higher education always preoccupied John Lombardi, reflecting his own personal struggle for education and his commitment to the open door of the community college. In 1962 he wrote with considerable concern, "The philosophy of junior college education is slowly being changed. . . . During the past five years the open door policy has been modified to the extent that many junior colleges are placing certain entering students on probation and every college has instituted probation and disqualification policies. . . . Now, another change is being advocated, namely, imposing a series of fees on junior college students." After reviewing the pros and cons of such a fee policy, he continued, "If fees will improve the quality of our student body, a valid educational argument could be made for them; however, fees are likely to give an added advantage to those who have money at the expense of worthy students who have limited financial resources. If the latter results, the gulf will widen between the privileged and the unprivileged. I consider the imposition of fees as a step backward in our long-standing tradition of offering equal opportunities to all our citizens." In his last annual State of the College address he recognized the changing attitudes toward the college's open door policy and the continuing debate on this topic when he said, "Probably no issue is more important for the future of our College and for all junior colleges. In many respects the debate parallels the struggle that was waged in our secondary schools when they were opened to all eligible youngsters. The arguments, too, had a similar ring. Then the uneducable were the children of immigrants from the slum neighborhoods in our cities; today, they are the children of Americans living in depressed or segregated neigh-borhoods of the same cities."

A consummate idealistic pragmatist, John Lombardi believed in the Golden Rule. Allergic to extravagance and conspicuous consumption, he lived a life that reflected his own public commitment to the values of hard work, careful husbandry of resources, and consistent pursuit of opportunity and achievement for everyone. Famous for his Spartan ways—he objected when the car manufacturers required us to buy a heater and radio whether we wanted one or not (he didn't want either)—John Lombardi proved unstinting in his support for the education of his children and others. We soon learned that a request for a frivolous item such as a radio or record player would fail when a casual request for books, papers, pencils, typewriters, and the other impedimenta of education would meet with instant and enthusiastic response. These virtues translated themselves into his written word.

John Lombardi wrote a simple, clear, and direct prose. Respectful of the thoughts and words of others, he quoted often from the books, articles, and presentations of scholars and commentators. His discussions of topics such as race relations on campus, finances, academic governance, or vocational education, persuaded because they avoided dramatic rhetoric or exaggerated claims, keeping instead to a carefully documented presentation, filled with facts and data, carrying a message in the persuasion of clarity rather than in the call to arms. The master of a graceful style of understatement, John Lombardi convinced because his style confronted the practical issues, the possible solutions, and the fundamental values rather than the emotional response to imaginary devils and angels.

All of us who learned with him knew that our success was his goal and that his status, standing, or significance concerned him not at all. Students, faculty, staff, administrators, and family found in John Lombardi that rare source of non-judgmental empathy, advice, and support.

Asking no recognition for himself, he found his reward in our achievements.

July 1992
John V. Lombardi
Mary Luciana Lombardi
Janice P. Lombardi

Introduction

PERSPECTIVES ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Scholarship, according to Vaughan (1988), is the systematic pursuit of a topic; an objective, rational inquiry that involves critical analysis. It rests on the ability to sustain consideration of a problem and its ramifications and to suspend judgment until all relevant information is available. It need not center on collecting original data. It can collate and synthesize, and associate the findings of other studies.

Higher education has long held as its ideal the scholar-practitioner. According to the highest standard, all who labor in the academic world should be at once practitioners of their craft and researchers who reflect on their practice and seek knowledge to inform it. Regardless of the position held, professor or administrator, this combination of scholarship and practice is supposed to be present.

But the ideal is far from being realized. Scholars are not necessarily the best teachers; administrators rarely base their decisions on research findings; teachers only occasionally seek to learn of best practices elsewhere. The literature of academe includes innumerable examples of scholarship that seems unrelated to practice and of reports of practice that give no indication of an awareness of the broader issues affecting that practice. Most administrators react to the concerns of the moment; the daily in-basket defines their agenda. When challenged, they reply that they have no time to reflect, that decisions must be made quickly, that the demands of their environment push objective inquiry to the rear.

John Lombardi was a rarity. He combined the ability to manage an institution with the curiosity and breadth of knowledge that reach toward an understanding of the extent of the field. A superb administrator and a brilliant scholar, he devoted his entire professional career to the community college: as an instructor, dean, administrator, and assistant superintendent in the Los Angeles Community College system. And all the while, in each of those positions, he sustained his scholarly interests, combining them with his routine work.

The essence of Lombardi's approach to his profession can be discerned by viewing the papers he wrote. Covering a 50-year span from the 1930s to the 1980s, this comprehensive oeuvre considered the faculty, finance, curriculum, students, governance, management, administration, and college role. Each topic that drew his attention received thoughtful analysis.

Lombardi reacted to the various crises that concerned community college administrators during his tenure. Were presidents apprehensive about being forced out of their jobs? Lombardi did a study comparing tenure rates over time. Did a financial crisis threaten college stability? Lombardi wrote several papers and a book about managing finances more efficiently. Were the colleges threatened by student activists? He studied the demands of the activists and the colleges' reactions to them. Did the advent of collective bargaining for faculty threaten to disrupt collegial relations? Studies of the actual effects of that innovation reveal the true patterns. How did the larger colleges accommodate managerial relations? Studies of the role of the department chair shed light on that issue. How did changing enrollment patterns affect college practices? What did the trend toward vocationalism do to the curriculum? What was the meaning of the associate degree? John Lombardi gave his attention to all these issues.

This volume includes ten of the Lombardi papers that are the most useful to the contemporary community college administrator. Each of the papers was written while Lombardi was a resident scholar at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges during the 1970s. Each is on a single major issue, placing it in context, analyzing it from an administrator's perspective, and offering recommendations to administrators who must contend with it. Thus the volume is useful for practicing college leaders and for students aspiring to leadership positions.

Most of the issues concerning community college administrators are perennial. A budget crisis is never solved. It may be ameliorated by additional funding or by some short-term reduction in expenses, but it inevitably reappears. Seeking staff must be undertaken continually as employees change jobs or retire. The objectives of curriculum do not change; students must always be directed toward basic literacy, workplace skills and attitudes, and visions of humanity. Student retention is a continuing concern and the extent of student learning and goal attainment is ever in question. The papers in this volume read as though they were written this year.

The first chapter discusses the periodic increases and declines in enrollment and the ways that college leaders attempt to sustain the enrollments on which their funding is based.

Chapter two is an analysis of the perennial issues in sustaining college finances. It includes a review of the feasibility of various stratagems for maintaining a constant flow of dollars into the institution.

The next three chapters are on managing the faculty. One discusses the workload formulas in relation to college operations. The second is a report on employing, paying, and supervising part-time instructors. And the third is a review of the department chair as an intermediary between the faculty and the administration.

Chapters six through nine analyze the central areas of curriculum. The chapter on vocational education discusses the growth and status of that function. Developmental education is broken out into its four major components with the background and prognosis given for each. Transfer education is shown to be a stable program on its own but a declining proportion of college offerings. And the community services programs are displayed as precariously funded, adjunctive areas of collegiate study.

The volume concludes with a chapter on student activism, pointing out how it has ebbed and flowed in response to events quite outside the colleges' control. An appendix provides a comprehensive listing of John Lombardi's writings.

Although Lombardi's writings have a reasonable, evenhanded tone, his firmly held beliefs shine through. He valued the democratic ideal of the common school and saw the community college as a latter-day extension of the elementary and secondary school systems. To him, school should be an integrating experience. For this reason he opposed student fees and segregated campuses along with any other actions that might serve to restrict anyone's access. All students deserved a chance at a quality education; therefore, enrollment should not be restricted under any guise. But at the same time, he recognized the colleges' limited ability to contribute to social welfare. The colleges provided avenues for individual attainment. They were not panaceas for all community ills.

Lombardi saw the community colleges' prime function as that which the early-century lower schools performed: socializing people to the American culture. He articulated that both in his commentaries on the conduct of community college education and in his own administrative work. When he was president of Los Angeles City College, he anticipated the ethnic and racial segregation that would overtake the campus as the population of its surrounding neighborhood evolved. Accordingly, to minimize the effect of the changing populations, he strengthened the foreign languages and several specialized occupational fields at the college so that students from other neighborhoods in the Los Angeles district would have to commute to City College. In that way the common-school ideal would be best sustained.

Lombardi was disdainful of myopic administrators and those university-based scholars who he felt were out of touch with institutional realities. The first group he saw as dishonest aggrandizers whose actions did a disservice to the institutions for which they spoke. The second group typically used inappropriate data to make inferences about community college successes and failures. He felt that the colleges deserved genuine study and analysis. Thus the commentators who drew unwarranted conclusions were as misguided as the administrators whose words revealed an unrealistic belief in institutional value so strong that it often resulted in hucksterism.

He believed in but he would not apologize for the community colleges. He was an analyst and a critic, in its meaning of one who is skilled in judging quality or merit. Much of his work put him in opposition to some of his contemporaries whose boosterism would shame a sunbelt community chamber of commerce. His down-to-earth explanations of the realities of the institutions may seem pedestrian, but they were written as counterfoils to the promotion pieces, self-congratulatory epics, calls for innovation as though that in itself would solve all problems, and predictions of unending growth that many of his contemporaries repeated. As Lombardi put it, to be effective, public relations must be realistic; it must not be so smooth as to deceive even those who conduct it into believing the propaganda.

Lombardi similarly disdained the administrators who felt they could manage the institutions down to the level of guiding student and faculty conduct in the most minute detail. Consistent with his belief that everyone should be given a chance, he knew that some instructors teach better than others and that some students learn more—some less—efficiently. The administrators who think that they can markedly affect the strength and direction of these activities by admonishing, evaluating, or otherwise interfering on a detailed level do little more than effect resentment. Better to take an evenhanded approach, recognize strengths and weaknesses, appreciate human frailty, and let people retain command of their own affairs. Lombardi did this while he was an administrator; he carried his vision into his own scholarship, writing clearly, expressing his values, sustaining a vision. A modest, realistic man, he brought modesty and realism to his work.

A word about Lombardi's terminology. Although the term "community college" was being used widely when Lombardi wrote these papers, he referred to the institutions as junior colleges, the appellation that was most prominent during the earlier years of his work. He used the word "he" as the collective term for students and faculty and "chairman" instead of chair or chairperson; the language had not yet been successfully de-gendered. Although he probably would not have objected if we changed his terms, we have retained his usage.

Arthur M. Cohen

References

Vaughan, G. (Spring 1988). Scholarship in Community Colleges: The Path to Respect. *Educational Record*, Vol. 69, No. 1, pp. 26-31.

Chapter 1

RIDING THE WAVE OF NEW ENROLLMENTS

Introduction

The spectacular growth of the community colleges since 1945 is probably the outstanding educational event of this era. Whether we think in terms of colleges, students, financial support, expenditures, or faculty, the numbers are staggering. During the second half of the 1960s the number of public two-year colleges increased at the rate of one or more a week, with a low of 51 during 1965 and a high of 91 during 1969. During the decade the total number almost doubled from 405 in 1960 to 794 in 1969. Even more impressive were enrollment numbers, which rose from 566 thousand in 1960 to more than two million in 1969, an increase of 262 percent. The yearly enrollment growth rate during the 1960s varied between 2.6 percent in 1960 and 24 percent in 1965 with a median of 14 percent.

Another index of growth is to compare enrollments in two-year and four-year colleges. The percentage of students who began their college careers in this new institution grew from 40 percent to 48 percent between 1969 and 1974 ("Opening Fall Enrollment . . .," 1974). As early as 1969 California colleges enrolled 88 percent of the first-time-in-college students, Florida, 65 percent and Michigan, 50 percent (Koltai and Thurston, 1971). Nationally the proportion of college-credit students in the two-year colleges has climbed steadily. In 1972 the two-year colleges enrolled 36.1 percent; and in 1974, 39.7 percent. If the upper division and graduate students were excluded, the proportion in the two-year colleges would approach 50 percent ("Opening Fall Enrollments . . .," 1974).

Lombardi, John. *Riding the Wave of New Enrollments*, Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper Number 50, June 1975.

So fascinated were the educators with these numbers that rising enrollments became the principal measure of success. Growth was equated with excellence. No other feature was highlighted more prominently in the media, at conferences, and in the professional journals. Because "data are concrete" and because qualitative measures are elusive, administrators "have come to believe that quantitative data are the only kind that have meaning in complex organizations" (Alfred, 1974).

These golden years of college expansion and enrollment growth induced an hypnotic effect on educators and leaders of their professional organizations. Few could imagine or would consider the possibility of a reversal of the upward trend. They looked for substantial growth to extend well into the twenty-first century. Despite the evidence that a slowdown was affecting every other segment of education, community college educators kept insisting that it would not affect them, not permanently anyway. In fact, they were certain that the growth rate would continue as the laggard states caught up with the pacesetter states of California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Texas, and Washington, which in 1969 accounted for two-thirds of all enrollments (America Association of Junior Colleges, 1970).

In the light of this euphoria it was not surprising that community college educators were stunned in 1971 and 1972 when enrollments failed to reach the projections they had made the previous year (Lombardi, 1972). For some, the miscalculation resulted in the painful process of reducing staff, an activity for which most administrators were unprepared. With some embarrassment they were forced to think of reduction in force (RIF) rather than recruitment of staff. Despite some recovery, formulating policies for implementing RIF has become a high priority activity and an important issue during collective bargaining negotiations.

An upturn in the enrollment curve in 1973 and 1974 dispelled some of the gloom of the previous two years. As a result of substantial enrollment increases in 1973 and 1974, educators began once again looking forward to a new series of annual yearly enrollment increases far into the 1980s.

The more recent optimism, however, is not as ebullient as that of the 1950s and 1960s. There are too many colleges with static or declining enrollments, and for many others the increases are not the kind that translate into the large enough numbers of full-time student equivalents (FTE) to match those of the 1960s and to generate comparable appropriations. FTE, not headcount, determines the amount of money the colleges receive. The lower rate of growth is compounded by the fact that the ratio of full-time to part-time has been getting lower and lower. To maintain the enrollment equivalent of the 1960s, colleges must enroll a great many more part-time students.

To do so they are resorting or being urged to resort to marketing and selling techniques. They have tapped practically the whole population range eighteen years or above as the source of students. In fact, were it not for the older men and women who are flocking to college in large numbers as participants and students, the situation for community colleges would be as serious as it is for other segments of education. This older age group has made up in large part for the decline of 18- to 22-year-olds who used to be the mainstay of the entering college population.

For community colleges, marketing and selling techniques to attract new sources of students include a proliferation of short or mini-courses, expanded work-study programs, multiplication of satellite sub-campuses, relaxed admission standards, and assumption of new functions including recreational and custodial for the elderly, literacy education for illiterates, and counseling for drug addicts and alcoholics. The suggestion has even been made that the college "serve as a broker" (Gleazer, 1973-1974) in seeing to it that identified postsecondary educational needs are met either through its services or other appropriate institutions, as ambitious a goal as it is unrealistic. One need not speculate too deeply to predict the reaction of senior college educators to this presumption.

Of the many other changes taking place in the colleges, none seems more dramatic than the redefinition of students, one of the principal causes of the high headcount enrollments. Today, some colleges include as students people who merely attend activities called continuing community services education or public service projects. As a result, enrollment comparisons with prior years may have less meaning than formerly and previous projections based on credit course enrollment must be modified or discarded. In the future we may be talking about people served rather than students enrolled.

All of these efforts are barely keeping effective enrollment, as measured by FTE, from declining. The overshadowing demographic statistics are foreboding. The approach of zero population growth, the declining birthrate, the drop in K-12 enrollment and the withdrawl from college attendance of a sizeable percentage of high school graduates are serious deterrents to the resumption of an enrollment surge comparable to that of the 1960s. The lower rate of college-going may be an indication of enrollment saturation in many states.

In the sections that follow, attention will be directed toward the various factors that influence enrollments in two-year colleges. The first section will start with population and its primary effects. The second will deal with other influences on enrollment: economic, political and social causes, campus proximity, low cost, reclassification of institutions, transfer or usurpation of functions from other segments, stratagems or artifices, and the part-time phenomenon.

Population

Population trends play a major role in the high enrollments in the two-year colleges. But, unlike the elementary and high school whose enrollment is almost directly related in a one-to-one relationship with population, the relationship in the two-year colleges is not so close. Two-year college educators have considerable flexibility in tapping the entire range of the population beyond the age of 17 or 18, while public school educators have much less flexibility with the fixed age limits assigned to them. Likewise, four-year colleges and universities have less opportunity to draw on other than high school graduates for their students and, except in the vocational-technical program area, they cannot deviate too far from their collegiate-type programs leading to the baccalaureate and higher degrees. In addition to flexibility in student age range, two-year colleges have much more freedom, in fact, much more encouragement to engage in the lower-than-college-level courses and programs that meet the needs of the new students.

Nevertheless, all projections of enrollment start out with population. Total numbers, births, age groups, marriages, sex distribution are studied to determine their probable effects on present and future enrollments. The use of such projections varies with the times. In the period of the population explosion educators concentrated on opening new colleges or adding new facilities to existing colleges, developing educational programs, staffing, financing, and other activities to take care of students. With declining rates of population growth educators "utilize the projection to generate activity that can cause events to occur that are contrary to the projections" (Suddarth and Others, 1974). In other words, rather than accept the inevitability of declining enrollments that normally accompany the declining rate of population growth, they adopt new recruiting methods and develop a variety of new educational reforms to attract other age groups to make up for the loss of 18- to 22-year-olds. Before discussing this activity a brief review of population trends and their effects on enrollment is in order.

The population increase since 1940 has had a primary impact on enrollments in all segments of education. As the population rose from 132 million in 1940 to 213 million on January 1, 1975 for a gain of 61 percent, so did enrollments, but at a much higher rate. Since the 18- to 22-year-olds constitute the largest percentage of freshmen students and over 90 percent of the full-time students (*The American Freshman . . .*, 1973), their importance to the two-year colleges becomes patent. On the negative side is the rate of college-going among high school graduates which from a high of 55 percent in 1968 declined to 49 percent in 1972.

Two-year colleges are countering the decline in the rate of growth among 18- to 22-year-olds and the rate of college going by catering to the older age groups. Recognition of the group's importance is evident in the recruiting efforts, curriculum changes, growth of outpost centers, and establishment of child-care centers on campus. The older students, predominantly part-timers, have raised the average age of all students to around 28 years. An expanded definition of student is being formulated and, at the same time, funding of adult education is being liberalized.

But no matter what rationalizations are used to minimize the demographic factors of lower population growth rates and the higher proportion of older people, they remain like a pall over the colleges. Daily reminders of elementary school closings and lower high school enrollments cannot help but dampen the optimism of two-year college educators. Zero population growth, if not already approached, is not too far away. Eventually, some two-year colleges will succumb as have public schools. A few are experiencing serious enrollment declines. Just as the rising birthrate that began in 1940 contributed to the large enrollment increases of the 1960s, reaching a peak in 1965 when enrollment increased by 24 percent over 1964 (Drake, 1975), so conversely, the decline of births since 1957 "represents the major force in determining . . . future postsecondary enrollment levels. . . ." (Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission, 1974). The decline in marriages and the increase in divorces, if continued, will accelerate the approach to zero population growth. The U.S. Census Bureau in a report "Marital Status and Living Arrangements" noted "a trend among young men and women to remain single for a longer period of time than in the past (Shaffer, 1975)."

Also significant for future enrollment trends is that since 1960 births declined by 30 percent while the number of women reaching childbearing age (20) increased by more than 65 percent. From now on the number of 20-year-old women will decrease in parallel with the number of births. According to the National Center for Health Statistics in 1974, marriages declined in number and rate for the first time since 1958 ("U.S. Marriages Decline," 1975). The population statistics are not auspicious for the future. Had two-year colleges continued to depend heavily on high school graduates and 18- to 22-year-olds, their enrollment growth rate would not have differed materially from that of four-year colleges and universities.

Paradoxically, population growth, though basic to the two-year college enrollment growth of the 1960s, does not wholly account for its phenomenal characteristics. Despite population increases, enrollment growth in the two-year colleges in some communities in a state did not parallel the upward population curve. Indeed, quite a few states did not establish two-year colleges until the late 1960s and early 1970s. In Indiana, for example, two-year comprehensive colleges are few and their growth has been stunted deliberately.

Why the Community College?

State and federal goals to extend universal education to the first two years of college were potent forces in the rise of two-year colleges. To achieve this objective two-year colleges were encouraged to maintain an open door policy (usually not even requiring high school graduation) and to impose only small charges for tuition and fees. To prevent or make difficult encroachment on the two-year colleges, states insisted that senior institutions be selective in admission, keep to a minimum the below-college-level and two-year occupational courses, as well as charge higher tuition and fees.

The establishment of these colleges did not happen automatically. They came into being because individuals and groups carried on campaigns to get support from community leaders; legislation authorizing the colleges; and most importantly, funds, sometimes from private sources, but mostly from the various government agencies, in particular, the local communities in the form of property taxes. In the forefront of this drive were college educators and leaders of the professional associations, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and regional and state associations, who marshalled the private and public forces for the establishment of colleges. Locally, communities—especially those that were not large enough to support a four-year college or university—went to great pains and expense to establish a two-year college, probably for pride, economics, and to keep their youth from emigrating to the cities.

It is somewhat amusing today to hear so much about the need for borrowing the techniques of marketing and selling used by business and industry. In light of the success of the educational leaders in establishing such a far-flung conglomerate of colleges one wonders who should be the teachers and who the disciples. A little book, *50 States/50 Years* (Yarrington, 1969), published by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, contains 20 capsules of techniques used for marketing and selling the two-year colleges to states and communities that probably have more credibility than those business and industry can provide during this period of bankruptcies and near bankruptcies. It is hardly likely that two-year college educators will soon suffer the fate of "motion pictures, the petroleum industry, dry cleaning, electrical utilities and grocery stores," assuming that the fate of all these industries is as serious as portrayed (Gleazer, 1973-1974).

The major part of the enrollment growth flowed directly from the addition of new colleges to existing systems and the establishment of new state systems making a two-year education available to a large proportion of the population. By law every area in such states as California, Florida, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, and Washington are or must become a part of a two-year college or postsecondary school district. The goal in most states is to have a two-year college or postsecondary school within commuting distance of 90 to 95 percent of the people. By 1974 the goal was achieved or was close to being achieved in California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, New York, Washington, and several other states.

State funding patterns encouraged the spread of two-year colleges by generous aid. Nationwide, the proportion of two-year college funding received from the state increased from 6.2 percent in 1963 to 15.5 percent in 1973 while the proportion for the senior institutions dropped from 39 percent to 33 percent (Glenny, 1974-1975). And, to prevent the prestigious universities from expanding at the expense of the two-year (and other public and private) colleges state legislators fixed ceilings on their enrollments (Millett, 1974).

The motives for priority funding for two-year colleges are mixed. But basic to this high priority is that they occupy the same role economically, politically, and socially as the elementary school did during the 1900s when immigrants formed a large percentage of the population. There is an additional correlation with earlier times. Then the country favored eliminating child labor; since 1950, concern has been over the social and economic disabilities of minorities and disadvantaged youth. The ability to operate with a much smaller proportion of the population in the work force than formerly also explains in part the interest of the state and federal governments in the two-year institutions.

Low operating cost and open access are two other factors in favor of community colleges. A few university educators question the claim of lower cost, insisting that their lower-division costs are comparable to or lower than those of the community colleges. By pointing to large classes and the use of teaching assistants, they sometimes make a strong case. But legislators are not impressed by such claims. On open access, there is no disagreement. In fact, many university educators welcome community colleges because it makes it possible for them to continue selective admissions. In a few states, however, university educators continue to oppose the establishment of community colleges, fearing that adequate state funds will become more difficult to obtain if they have to share then. If the two-year colleges continue to attract a larger proportion of the first-time-in-college students the number in this group may be augmented and their opposition may intensify.

Proximity, low cost and financial aid go a long way in explaining why 95 percent or more of the two-year college students attend college in their own home states (Simon and Grant, 1972). Consistently, enrollments have increased directly with the number of colleges established in consonance with most studies of college-going patterns that place proximity to college close to the top as an inducement. Availability and proximity make it possible for large numbers of middle- and low-income people who are not able to afford the costs involved in living away from home to attend the local two-year college.

In addition to the usual campuses with a full complement of buildings and services, community colleges are establishing outposts or satellite mini-campuses in stores, churches, prisons, retirement centers, libraries, hospitals, supermarkets, public school buildings; in fact, any place that can accommodate ten or more students. These outposts attract older people and many of the traditional college-age people who may be unable to get to a campus or who find the campus environment foreign or forbidding. The huge 900 square mile Los Angeles Community College district "is serving 16,505 students in 522 classes at the 145 locations" in its Outreach Program (Los Angeles Community College District, 1974), while a small rural college in Southern Appalachia offers continuing education programs in 40 to 50 locations each term (Cottingham and Cooper, 1975). By design or by necessity, Austin Community College in Texas, Whatcom Community College in Washington (Lombardi, 1973) and the Vermont Community College system conduct all of their education in such centers rather than on fixed campus sites (Parker and Vecchitto, 1973). The movement toward such outreach programs continues to spread across the country.

Since campuses and outreach centers make classes readily available, the college-without-walls movement has made very limited progress among the two-year colleges. Interest in instructional television crops up from time to time, causes a flurry and then recedes. In recent years a few colleges, through their own broadcasting stations or through public and commercial stations, have offered courses individually or in concert (Lombardi, 1974a). These efforts, a minor supplement to the outpost centers, have had a minimal effect on enrollment.

Equally effective as a factor in choice of college is low tuition and fees. Although tuition and fees have risen in all institutions of higher education, states tend to establish lower maximum limits for two-year colleges than for state colleges and universities on the assumption that lower tuition and fees will divert prospective students to these colleges, an assumption supported by the Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education's conclusion that every $100 increase in public four-year college tuition will reduce enrollment by 2.5 percent and more dramatically by the decline of the enrollments in the private/independent junior colleges (Leslie and Johnson, 1974).

The effect of low cost on the private or independent two-year colleges has been devastating. More than any other sector of education, they have suffered from the competition of no- or low-tuition community colleges that have been lavishly supported by local, state, and federal funds. Here are the forgotten institutions of modern times. Much has been written on the importance of rescuing private higher (university) education and elementary and secondary schools but very little concern has been expressed for the survival of the private junior colleges. The disappearance of more than 100 colleges in the past twenty-five years has not caused a ripple, so entranced has the public been with the spectacular increase in community colleges. The dramatic rise of these schools, with its focus on the goal of universal higher education and low cost, has so completely overshadowed the private colleges that most people hardly know of their existence (Lombardi, 1973).

The two-year colleges probably have made greater inroads on the enrollments of senior institutions. Here again low costs plus lower entrance requirements account for the higher percentage of first-time-in-college students going to the two-year colleges. True, some senior institution educators encouraged the less capable high school graduates to enroll in the two-year colleges, but since 1969 they have not been so eager in this regard. Now with their enrollments turning down they are recruiting less selectively. However, these efforts do not overcome the advantages of low cost and accessibility. As tuition in private four-year colleges and universities keeps getting higher—up to $4,000 in some—a large number of potential students will be priced out of these institutions. Some of them will attend the public senior institutions and others will gravitate toward the two-year colleges.

Financial aid to students has aided enrollment in nearly all colleges. State and federal aid, guaranteed and subsidized loans, and work-study grants help many young people to enter and stay in college. An important aspect of financial aid is that most of it is based on need rather than scholastic ability or excellence (Lombardi, 1973). In recent years the amount of state aid has risen significantly. Forty-five states in 1975 have student-assistance programs compared with 22 in 1970 and 12 in 1964 (Winkler, 1974).

With the new emphasis on need, financial aid has been particularly helpful in enabling a large number of people to enroll in the two-year colleges. The largest group of beneficiaries are the veterans and the dependents of veterans, who receive more generous grants under the G.I. Bill than other students under any other grants. Moreover, they are not precluded from applying for other assistance. The full effect of the G.I Bill on enrollment of Vietnam veterans has been felt in the 1973 and 1974 enrollments. In California 127,000 veterans represented 13.4 percent (with a range of 6.0–26.1) of the total enrollment in 6 of 69 districts reporting in Fall 1973. Veterans also contribute to the effective FTE enrollments since 52.9 percent are full-time students compared with 33 percent for the non-veterans (Analytical Unit, 1974).

A second large group of beneficiaries are the poor, disadvantaged, and minorities. As for the veterans, but not on so generous a scale, special appropriations for their aid are made by state legislatures and Congress. Colleges are also given extra subsidies as incentives to recruit students in this category. Aid for the students from middle-income families is substantial in the aggregate but it is inadequate when the large number who need it is taken into account. Students from this group who need aid must obtain it from home or work. Otherwise, they drop out. The situation may change if the pressure mounts for greater aid for this group.

The New Majority—Part-Time Students

Among the many factors that have enabled the two-year colleges to sustain growth, the increase of part-time students ranks high. While the part-time students phenomenon is characteristic of all postsecondary institutions' it is most pronounced in the two-year colleges where the percentage of part-time students rose from 49.4 to 56.0 between 1969 and 1973.

In 1969 part-time enrollment exceeded the full-time enrollment in 11 states; in 1972, in 18 states; in 1973, in 26 states. For 1973, the 26 states included 15 of the 20 states with the largest enrollment. Exceptions among states with very large enrollments were New York with 129,000 full-time and 104,000 part-time, Florida with 68,000 full-time and 64,000 part-time, and North Carolina with 36,063 full-time and 29,967 part-time.

A decline in the enrollment of 18- and 19-year-olds who normally have been full-time students, and the increasing number of those who combine work and study, have been major contributors to the increasing proportion of part-time over full-time students. From more than 54 percent of 18- and 19-year-olds attending college in 1969, the percentage dropped to 48 in 1970 and to 43 in 1973 (Peck and Lincicum, 1974).

Off-campus learning units, week-end colleges, senior citizen institutes or emeriti colleges, and expanded campus and evening divisions are the organizational strategies that help augment the rolls with part-time students. So important are the part-time students to the welfare and survival of the colleges that they are receiving unusual attention not only at recruiting time but also during and after their enrollment, which in some colleges may take place at any time (Polk and Hendricks, 1975). More counseling, greater financial and placement aid, better services such as food, recreation, library, and lounge facilities, and extra-curricular activities are being provided. Administrative services are increasing as administrators are redeployed to serve in the evening hours. Courses and programs are being redesigned and new ones, many in smaller packages, are developed to more adequately meet the needs of the part-timers. To take care of students' children, childcare centers are sprouting on many campuses. Tuition for senior citizens is either reduced or waived.

Part-time students are the new majority on the two-year campuses. By 1980 they will represent two-thirds of the student body in at least half the states; already, in 1973, they represented over 70 percent of the enrollment in Arizona, Maryland, Michigan and Wisconsin. When the new definition of students is accepted by those states that have not yet done so, or when non-credit students are included in the enrollment statistics by all colleges, the national figures for part-time students will be truly phenomenal.

Reclassification or Transfer of Institutions and Functions

Engrossment with the phenomenal enrollment growth of the two-year colleges has obscured the fact that this growth has resulted not only from the people who did not formerly go to college, but by the addition of students from other segments of education, particularly vocational-technical, adult, and special schools, urban skill centers, and branches of senior colleges and universities, and in recent years of large numbers of people who are not, in the traditional definition, students. This latter group comprises individuals who attend a series of activities that may or may not be related to each other, that do not entail the strict procedures of admission and enrollment, and that hardly ever require any form of accountability of learning progress. In fact, it may be said that much of the increase in enrollment that comes from these developments does not constitute a true net increase of students in educational institutions; it represents a transfer of students from one segment of education to another or results from the redefinition of student. These phenomena do not flow in one direction; there is a constant ebb and flow. However, on balance the two-year colleges have added more institutions and more students from them than they have lost. It will become evident in the discussion that follows that the accretion of new categories of institutions and the acceptance of the new definition of student will produce a transformation of the two-year colleges. If these changes persist, the two-year colleges will become community-education centers, one of the long-term goals of the leaders of the movement. Whether or not they remain institutions of higher education is moot.

Transfers of institutions from one segment to another, common in all segments of education, have been quite prevalent in the two-year sector. As a result of this interchange, the classification of schools, colleges and universities for statistical purposes is not as clear-cut as the enrollments presented for the various institutions would imply. Sometimes the transfer of an institution from one category to another is made arbitrarily by a governing board or a statistical gathering agency. At other times financial exigency is the cause. Often it is made on rational grounds—either because of age group attending or educational programs offered.

As the Carnegie Commission technical report, *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, pointed out, "classification . . . does not remain fixed. New colleges enter the universe of institutions of higher education every year, and others go out of existence" (1973). But such changes for the two-year colleges are much more than small additions or deletions. They often involve whole systems or groups or institutions and they sometimes invoke spirited or bitter controversy. Abetting this transfer is the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, one of whose continuing objectives "is to encompass in membership, as fully as possible, all community-based postsecondary institutions" (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974a).

Illustrative of the transfers to two-year college status are the following: 1) Frank Wiggins Trade School and the Metropolitan School of Business were transferred in 1947 from the Unified School District to the Junior College District by the Los Angeles Board of Education, a common governing board for both districts; 2) In 1965, four vocational-technical schools became the first colleges in the University of Hawaii Community College System; 3) In 1971, the Nebraska legislature created eight technical community college areas to operate "any state vocational-technical college, area vocational school or junior college in their respective areas" (Nebraska Legislature, 1971); 4) In Iowa, community colleges became area schools, thereby embracing all adult education programs (Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1975). A few transfers of private colleges to public two-year colleges have also taken place but these have been of minor importance in terms of students (Millet, 1974).

Although not a transfer of institutions from one segment to another segment, enrollments in the two-year colleges have been augmented by reclassifying institutions for statistical purposes. More and more frequently agricultural, technical, vocational, and adult schools are being included in the statistics of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and other statistical gathering agencies. In many states these institutions exist side by side with community colleges. So do two-year branches of senior colleges that opt to be classified as community colleges, even though they maintain close liaison in governance and curriculum with the main campus. Within this group are the twenty-five campuses of eight Ohio universities that comprise more than half of the state's public two-year colleges with combined enrollments of close to 30,000. Others are found in Louisiana, New Mexico, South Carolina, and Wisconsin. A reverse process took place in 1974 with the delisting of the two-year branch campuses of the Pennsylvania State University (Drake, 1975).

Inroads on Functions of Other Segments

Significant impact on enrollment of the two-year schools has come and continues to come from the shift or usurpation of educational functions formerly performed by the high school or area vocational school. This process began early in the history of the community college movement. For example, despite the efforts of the early junior college leaders to delimit the occupational programs to those between the trade school levels and the full professional levels, educators expanded occupational programs by including the trades. Also, after 1945, they made great inroads in the adult education area. By the end of the 1960s, two-year college educators were creating a rationale now accepted in some states—Iowa, Nebraska, and Wisconsin—for exclusive jurisdiction over all public postsecondary education below the baccalaureate level.

Many transfers of functions take place at the request of or with the acquiescence of public and private agencies that find it beneficial—organizationally and financially—to divest themselves of part or all of their educational activities. These agencies include police, fire and recreational departments, hospitals, public and private agencies catering to retired people, the American Institute of Banking, supermarkets, churches and temples. Because of the doubtful legality of offering courses at public expense exclusively for special interest groups, the brochures announcing such courses usually mention that, "Students may register for off-campus classes at the location."

Transfer of functions is often encouraged by generous funding by local, state, and federal jurisdictions. Special and higher differential funding of programs for technical-vocational, the disadvantaged, minorities, illiterates, and the elderly provide powerful incentives for two-year college administrators to enter into these areas, so largely lower-than-college level. States often permit the lowering or remitting of tuition for these special students. Thus, those colleges in Virginia that permit students in Developmental Studies to enroll at any time in the quarter may pro-rate the tuition ("Virginia's 23 Community Colleges . . .," 1974).

Announcement by college presidents and by state board directors stress headcount enrollments rather than FTE enrollments. They signify that henceforth emphasis will be on individuals who are serviced or touched by the two-year college experience. These large numbers and the rates of increase they produce are paraded before legislators and in the media by two-year college educators in order to make the best possible case for more funds. At the same time, educators are not shy about making comparisons with enrollments in the other segments of higher education. The impact of a statement that "the public community colleges have enrolled more students than any other type of higher education institution in the state (Illinois) since 1972 and have consistently shown the highest rate of growth" is not easily controverted (Illinois Community College Board, 1975, p. 3).

Educators accept the number of students served and a corollary measure, the ratio of students to the total population—or for a better result, the ratio to the population 16 years or older—as measures for some form of excellence. Thus, the Chancellor of the California college system proudly announced that one out of every 12 Californians ages 18 to 64 is now a community college student, up from one of every 26 in 1960. If those served by campus concerts, lectures, and athletic events, and the like were included the ratio would be even more impressive (*Peralta Colleges Bulletin*, 1974). The director of Florida's Division of Community Colleges, was even more ecstatic over the unprecedented rise in headcount enrollments for 1974: one of every 10 persons 16 years or older (Wygal and Owen,1975). A few are more restrained, pointing to this ratio only as "a measure of the extent of service the community colleges are providing" (Illinois Community College Board, 1975). Rare is an acknowledgement that "outputs" of enrollment characteristics do not "adequately reflect the qualitative aspects of a student's experience in college," noting that "there are many non-quantifiable functions relating to community service and to students enrolled in non-credit courses (State of New Jersey, Department of Higher Education, 1974). Indeed, headcount enrollment figures are heady for two-year college educators. They make excellent copy for news releases and more importantly, are about the most effective argument for increased state and federal appropriations. Barring a financial collapse, more states will join those that have redefined "student."

Students of proprietary postsecondary institutions are another large group toward which some public two-year college administrators cast longing, acquisitive eyes. They hope to woo these students by establishing a large network of outpost classes, more frequent enrollment dates, shorter and more practical skill courses. They also support the enactment of stringent regulatory legislation forcing some of the schools to close and requiring others to be more accurate in their advertising (Arnstein, 1975).

But two-year college educators encounter some resistance from strongly entrenched adult and vocational education groups. In California this resistance has been of long standing, sometimes accompanied by unusual acrimony and bitterness. In the late 1950s two-year college educators were forced by pressure from adult and vocational education leaders to accept legislation on criteria and standards for graded courses that attempted to delineate their jurisdiction on the basis of educational objectives of the students rather than on age alone (California Office of Administrative Hearings, California Administrative Code). However, the restrictions are easily evaded, particularly since they contain weak and ineffectual enforcement provisions. In fact, in recent years two-year colleges have expanded in the area of literacy education, euphemistically labelled adult basic education.

Two-year colleges are also encountering competition from the four-year colleges and universities (Ricklefs, 1975). At all times in their 75-year existence, two-year colleges have had open and covert competition from senior institutions, many of which offered two-year liberal arts and vocational-technical programs. It reached a low point—but never ceased—during the 1960s when the emphasis was on upgrading from teachers colleges and technical institutes to state colleges and in recent years to state universities. Despite this upgrading, 463 four-year colleges and universities still offered associate degrees in 1971.

Stratagems and Artifices

Two-year colleges are as adept as the senior institutions in the use of stratagems or artifices to increase enrollments. Some of these are modifications of practices that should have been instituted long ago; others may be just temporary expedients, necessary for the moment but to be discontinued as soon as the emergency is over; a few are of doubtful legality; and a number are unethical if not dishonest in nature.

The pressure to sell the college and recruit students has become so widespread that it has made sprightly copy for newspapers, magazines, and professional journals. A few educators have spoken out against the growth of unethical practices in these efforts to lure students. Legislators conduct investigations that lead to corrective laws, state coordinating commissions attempt to keep competition under control and state auditors become more vigilant in their scrutiny of enrollment reports submitted by colleges for fund-ing purposes.

The frantic scramble for students raises questions concerning educators' motives—which they profess to be for the good of the people and for the welfare of society. Rarely mentioned is that the welfare of the educational establishment, rather than the students, is paramount—especially as it affects administrators whose prestige has become so dependent upon large enrollments (the cult of gigantism) and the organizations whose appropriations rise and fall with fluctuations in enrollment. Management shares the conviction so admirably expressed by Churchill that one does not become a leader of an organization to preside at its liquidation. Indeed, survival and growth are the new goals; the central purposes are indefinite expansion and unlimited creation of new but unrealizable needs.

Unlike administrators, faculty and their representatives use few euphemisms in justifying recruitment of greater numbers as a means of preserving jobs, for "students represent a life sustaining flow of resources" (Leslie and Miller, 1974). Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, "advocates educare, a lifelong education program from preschoolers to senior citizens, to eliminate teacher unemployment and to improve the quality of life" (1974). Representatives of 23 organizations including the AFT and NEA issued a statement deploring attempts to cut federal educational appropriations suggesting instead that budget balancing be achieved by making cuts elsewhere (Neill, 1974).

The stratagems start at the beginning, recruiting. An Arizona college president facetiously remarked at a conference that he looked for students behind every cactus bush. In their policy analysis of long-range enrollment trends for Oregon, Peck and Lincicum (1974), wrote that "both the decline in general enrollments and shifting patterns promise to increase inter- and intra-segmental desires to maintain student bodies to the maximum institutional advantage. Already, recruitment competition is mounting." Alfred, formerly director of institutional research for Metropolitan Community College District in Kansas City, Missouri, reported that in his state there is an annual recruiting war for high school graduates, producing in the process an atmosphere of survival of the fittest (1973). In this competition, educators are resorting to advertising through wide distribution of circulars, schedules of classes and catalogs, notices in the local press, and, of course, radio and television.

To make it easy for the recruits to enroll, colleges relax admission standards and ignore application deadlines. Transferees with poor records are admitted with little question. Counseling is increased to help students interpret the complications of a college schedule and to encourage them to enroll in as many units as possible and in a few cases in courses that have low enrollments. Students are told that after attending classes they may drop one or more of the courses they find difficult or unsatisfactory. Instructors are subtly advised not to drop students from their classes until after the census date when enrollments are counted for state funding purposes.

To encourage students to remain in class, penalty grades for withdrawal are either eliminated or assigned only for withdrawals late in the semester. Scholarship standards, modified in the 1960s to help disadvantaged students, now apply to all students. Grades are getting higher; few students are dismissed for scholarship deficiency. Some padding of enrollments, particularly in classes with low enrollments, occasionally takes place. Colleges that are funded on the basis of student class hours raise the number of hours for as many courses as possible.

These stratagems make the difference between a decline and an increase in enrollment ("Ethics of Recruiting . . .," 1975). One large college, which estimated a decline of 1,000 for the Fall semester at the August deadline date for applications for admission, continued to accept applications until the enrollment reached the number of the previous year. Keeping inactive students on the rolls until after the census date could add as much as one to two percent to the enrollment. This artifice is less effective for colleges charging tuition than for those with no or small tuition, since refund policies act as an incentive for students to withdraw officially as soon as possible.

Legislators aware of such stratagems to increase enrollment are attempting to control or eliminate those which are contrary to the spirit as well as the letter of the law. Some two-year college administrators are having the same unpleasant experience as two Florida state university presidents who were accused of increasing enrollments by creating phantom credits through artificial juggling of graduate units (Van Dyne, 1974). Skepticism of California legislators on the alleged practice of keeping inactive students on the rolls is resulting in resolutions and bills such as one requiring two census dates rather than one in determining enrollments for each term. More serious are the audits made of the college enrollment reports. In 1973 California auditors found that colleges applied for state subventions for enrollment in courses offered exclusively for people in specific agencies, the most flagrant being in the fire and police science programs. Enrollments in such programs are not eligible for state appropriations.

One would like to write that exhortations from their colleagues or the threat of auditors will help administrators become less vulnerable to temptations to increase enrollments by illegal or unethical means, but past experience gives no support for this hope. Whenever an enrollment decline is threatened the educators find means and reasons for some stratagems. During the Korean crisis a few administrators counted the time students spent in the library and the counseling office for enrollment purposes. Some even installed turnstiles!

Not all stratagems mentioned above are unethical or illegal. The majority are, in fact, beneficial and should be continued regardless of the enrollment trend. Among these are better recruiting to attract all strata of the population, elimination of arbitrary application deadlines, open-ended or continuous enrollment, improved enrollment procedures, reexamination of scholarship and grading policies and establishment of centers of learning near students' homes or workplaces. Particularly encouraging are the efforts to reduce attrition rates through better counseling and teaching. Of course, many of the stratagems would not be necessary if colleges found a way to reduce attrition rates so that fewer students fail or become discouraged and a larger percentage of the Fall semester students re-enroll in the Spring semester.

Conclusion

For the past several years two-year college educators have been acting as if the enrollment curve will continue to slope upward indefinitely. Their ability to reverse periodic downturns in rate of growth convinces them that new strategies in recruiting, new teaching techniques, new delivery systems, and many internal administrative reforms can overcome the adverse effect of a declining population growth rate, even the approaching era of zero growth. They recognize that much of their good fortune results from having wide popular and governmental support, support which has made it possible to establish a network of campuses and satellite centers within easy reach of a large proportion of the population. This support is predicated on their willingness to accept all adults, regardless of previous educational experience and to modify their educational philosophy to include programs heretofore labelled less-than-college grade. Coupled with the easy accessibility is their low tuition and fee policy.

They look on the increase in part-time students as another example of their ability to be on the "cutting edge" of change. This transformation may not have been the educators' design, but once they observed the trend, they capitalized on it by catering to "the new breed of students" the part-time majority composed of older students, senior citizens, women, younger students who must work to support themselves, convicts, parolees, physically handicapped, illiterates, and near illiterates.

Above all, two-year college educators have an unquestioned faith in the efficacy of their educational program to bring the good life—a degree, a skill, recreational activity—to the people—so much so that they adopt the marketplace principle of the existence of a consumer need which must be filled and for which they must develop an educational program, course, or activity to service. They may deny that they subscribe to the corollary that even if the student doesn't need more education they are duty bound to convince him that he can profit from it. But skeptics from within and the irreverent from without compare their efforts to attract students through such products as mini-courses, credit for life experiences, and recreational activities to television and radio sales pitches for cold and pain remedies.

Nevertheless, two-year college educators are bolstered in their belief by the results—people are coming to the campuses and satellites in greater numbers than to any other segment of higher education. It seems obvious to them that if students keep coming they must like their products—more important that the products are what students want. They also believe that the products are good for them. In this belief they get encouragement from testimonials, from legislators, public office holders, influential citizens, and occasionally students. They exhibit some concern and anguish, if not outright disbelief, when a report appears claiming that special programs for the disadvantaged and vocational training miss their goals.

Within the walls not a few instructors are dismayed at the changes taking place as illiterates and near illiterates fill the seats made empty by the decline in academically qualified high school graduates. Though these new students prevent reduction in force the tenured instructors keep deploring the debasement of the college and the continuance of second class education (Zwerling, 1974). They see these efforts as an artificial bolstering of enrollment, and as posing the greatest risk confronting the two-year colleges today. However, they seem helpless to counteract "The Selling of the Community College" (Norris, 1975).

Though the administrators overcome most of the criticisms, they are confronted with the problem of developing a new identity for the institution. As they recruit more and more students incapable of college-level work, they feel the necessity for downplaying their higher education role. Their search for a new name is already under way; for some time in fact a few felt that too many concentrated on "college" and overlooked the "community." Some think the joining of this issue is long overdue. The president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges said, "In the phrase 'community college,' the accent too often has been on the word 'college'" (Gleazer, 1973-1974). Rhetorically, he asked, "Is our field community colleges or postsecondary education?"

It is unlikely that the term "college," which still has high favor among students and educators, will soon be dropped. For too long the two-year college educators have struggled to maintain their association with the state colleges and universities. Wherever a union of the two-year colleges and technical institutions has taken place the term "college" is always incorporated in the conglomerate. There is little to suggest that practicing educators including those searching for a new mission will follow the leaders away from the higher education or college orientation.

However, it may happen that the term "community college" may sink so low in prestige that the regular students will move to the state colleges and universities, especially if entrance requirements are relaxed and larger financial inducements are offered. Then, as Corcoran (1972) implied, the community colleges may become "The Slums of Higher Education."

For those who still believe in the community college as a legitimate segment of higher education, the task ahead is formidable. In their quest for ever greater enrollments they cannot neglect the needs of the traditional college-oriented students in the academic and technical areas. They must provide them with high-grade courses and programs so that the academic students can continue their education at the university and the technical can hold middle management positions in business and industry. Otherwise, an academic form of Gresham's Law will operate—the less capable students will drive out the more capable.

Pragmatically, the two-year college educators are not so shortsighted that they do not see how vital the traditional students are to the economy of their enterprise. They certainly are aware of the fact, if the public is not, that in terms of effective enrollment as measured by FTE the academic and technical students continue to generate the largest portion of state funds. The other students, the participants in recreational programs, short courses, and special events, swell the headcount but produce fewer FTEs.

Nevertheless the heads of the major associations and a few college presidents and chancellors are groping for a conceptual basis for nontraditional study reflecting "functions and services to students rather than institutional bureaucracy." They seek to justify as "collegiate educational services" the courses, programs, and activities that are provided for the nontraditional students who formerly attended adult education institutions (Park, 1975). They seek a shift from a degree orientation to a service dimension, thus countering what they feel is the public's obsession for degrees. They are placing their hopes on community-based education, financed in part by "a new pattern of state support" (Koltai, 1974) and in part by the federal government ("New National Legislation Is Proposed . . .," 1975).

It remains to be seen how stable the influx of new students will be. Today, it appears that the population contains such a large potential that the two-year colleges will not suffer an enrollment decline, as have the elementary and secondary schools and other higher education institutions. This reasoning overlooks the possibility, indeed the probability, that a saturation point will be reached for the nontraditional cohort just as it has been reached for the 18- to 22-year-olds or the high school graduates. Eventually the percentage of older students attending the two-year colleges will cease to rise and may even decline. If the population should show an actual decline or if the proportion of those over 60 continues to grow at its present rate, saturation may be reached shortly after 1980.

A new era is beginning for the two-year colleges. The prospect is for continued absorption of more nontraditional functions including those formerly classified as less-than-college level. At the same time adult and vocational education institutions of the high school or area vocational schools are being placed under the aegis of the two-year colleges. In this new era the two-year colleges may be transformed into institutions in which the collegiate character will be subordinated to the "community" aspect. Before this happens, however, there is likely to be a serious struggle between the traditionalists and the nontraditionalists. Even those who plead for moving in the new direction recognize there are problems. Gleazer has noted, "Some community colleges are highly preoccupied with the academic credit and transfer role; faculty members 'love' academically qualified students; there is a serious need for retraining of presidents, vice presidents, and faculty" (1973-1974).

Notwithstanding the flowing statements that accompany reports of large increases in headcount enrollment, the community college leaders know or are reminded that "The Boom Slows" (Scully, 1974). Their search for new students, their willingness to transform the college from an institution of higher education to a postsecondary institution that enrolls any person for almost any course, program, or activity, their intensified efforts to absorb more of the adult and vocational education functions conducted by the secondary school are signs of dynamism, but they also reflect uneasiness over the enrollment situation. Their faith in the historical role of the community college as a two-year collegiate postsecondary institution offering transfer, general education, and vocational education programs is weakening, as is attested by the arguments for abandoning it. For many, including state and national leaders, adherence to the historical role is the prelude to decline.

The drift toward serving all the people over 17 years of age is merely an extension of the postulate enunciated a quarter century ago by President Truman's Commission on Higher Education (U.S. President's Commission . . ., 1947), i.e., at least half of America's youth are capable of profiting from education through grade 14. If we count participants in the various college services and activities, the goal of universal higher education seems within reach. And since Americans see promise in education, the contribution of the public two-year college in the achievement of this goal stands as its most signal contribution. It has performed and continues to perform for the disadvantaged of the second half of the Twentieth Century what the elementary schools did for the children of immigrants in the early years of the century. Were it not for the danger that in their zeal two-year college educators may be promising more than their colleges can deliver and thereby creating a disillusionment with two-year college education similar to that with today's elementary schools, we could look to the future of the two-year college with continued hope. One must wonder, however, if the two-year college (or any institution) can develop an effective educational program for a student body or clientele whose aptitude is far wider in range and whose interests are more diverse than have been experienced before the recent upsurge in enrollment.

References

Adult education is studied. (Spring, 1974). *Virginia Community College System News*, p. 2.

Alfred, R. L. (1973). *Assessment of community college enrollment patterning: A sociocultural analysis.* Kansas City, MO: Metropolitan Junior College District, ED 078 834.

Alfred, R. L. (1974). *Master plan for educational research and development.* New York: New York City Community College of the City University of New York.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1974). *Community: Annual report of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.* Washington, DC.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (February, 1975). News Release.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1970–1975). *Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory.* Washington, DC. (published annually)

The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1973. (1974). Los Angeles, CA: Cooperative Institutional Research Program, American Council on Education and University of California.

Analytical Unit, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges. (October 1974). *Fall 1973 Veterans Enrollment in California Community Colleges.* Mimeographed report.

Arnstein, G. E. (1975). Accreditation, state licensing and approvals: Why the system isn't working. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *56*(8), 396–398.

Bundy, R. F. (1974). Accountability: A new Disneyland fantasy. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *56*(3), 176–180.

California Department of Finance. (1973). *Total and full-time enrollments in California institutions of higher education, Fall 1973.* Sacramento, CA.

California Community and Junior College Association. (1975). *Sacramento Scene*, *8*(1), 1.

California Office of Administrative Hearings. *California administrative code.* Title 5, Sections 55000-55002. Sacramento, CA: Department of General Services, Documents Section, (loose leaf) p. 640, 640.1.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1973). *A classification of institutions of higher education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, ED 088 339.

City Colleges of Chicago. (September–October 1974). *News*, *8*(1), 3.

City Colleges of Chicago. (November–December 1974). *News*, *8*(2), 1.

Cohen, M. J. (1972). Junior College Growth. *Change*, *4*(9), 32a–32d.

Community College Council of the California Federation of Teachers (December, 1974). *AFT community college perspective.*

Connor, A. (1972). A look at the future. In American Association of Junior Colleges, *1972 Junior college directory* (pp. 6–8). Washington, DC., 1972.

Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System. (December, 1974). *CB Report, 9*(12), 3.

Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System. (1975). *Texas higher education 1968–1980: A report to the 64th Texas legislature.* Austin, TX.

Corcoran, T. B. (September, 1972). Community colleges: The coming slums of higher education? *Change, 4*(7), 30–35.

Cottingham, T., and Cooper, L. (Summer, 1975). Southern Appalachia: A special challenge. *New directions for community colleges: Reforming academic governance, 3*(2), 19–26.

Drake, S. (1975). The data/some interpretations. In American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *1975 Community, junior, and technical college directory* (pp. 2–4). Washington, DC.

Enrollment rose 4 pct. this fall, study indicates. (November, 1974). *Chronicle of Higher Education, 9*(8), 2.

Esquibel, A. (1974). *A review of public two-year institutions of higher education in New Mexico.* Albuquerque, NM: Department of Educational Administration and Foundations.

Ethics of recruiting stirs spirited debate. (January, 1975). *College Board News, 3*(2), 3.

Florida Association of Community Colleges. (1975). *FACC Current, 7*(5), 1.

Florida Department of Education, Division of Community Colleges. (1974). *Fall 1974 opening enrollment—headcount: Florida community colleges.* Tallahassee, FL.

Florida Department of Education, Division of Community Colleges. (1972). *Report for Florida's community colleges 1971–72.* Tallahassee, FL.

Florida Department of Education, Division of Community Colleges. (1973). *Report for Florida's community colleges 1972–73.* Tallahassee, FL.

Gleazer, E. J., Jr. (1975). Introduction. In American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *1975 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory.* Washington, DC.

Glenny, L. A. (1974-1975). Nine myths, nine realities: The illusions of steady state. *Change, 6*(10), 24–28.

Haywood, C. R. (1974). Two by four: Associate programs in traditionally four-year and graduate degree granting institutions. *Journal of Higher Education, 45*(9), 682–690.

Henderson, L. (September–October, 1974). Plug in. *FACC Current* (Official Newsletter of the Florida Association of Community Colleges), *7*(1), 5

Hooper, M. E. (1973). *Associate degrees and other formal awards below the baccalaureate, 1970–71*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Illinois Community College Board. (February, 1974). *Community College Bulletin*, *8*(6), 4.

Illinois Community College Board. (September, 1974). *Community College Bulletin*, *9*(2), 4.

Illinois Community College Board. (1970). *Report of selected data and characteristics of Illinois public junior colleges 1969–1970*. Springfield, IL.

Illinois Community College Board. (1975). *Student enrollment data and trends in the public community colleges in Illinois: Fall 1974*. Springfield, IL.

Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. (1975). *Opportunities in Iowa's area achools, 1974–75*. Des Moines, IA.

Johnson, D. F. (May, 1972). The future of work: Three possible alternatives. *Monthly Labor Review*, *95*(5), 3–11.

Koltai, L. (1974). A new dimension. Speech Delivered at the Academic Resource Expedition, University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Education, ED 091 010.

Koltai, L., & Thurston, A. S. (1971). The community colleges. In E. J. Gleazer, Jr. & J. F. Cooke (Eds.), *American junior colleges* (8th ed.). Washington, DC: American Council on Education, pp. 3–10.

Leslie, L. L., & Miller, H. F., Jr. (1974). *Higher education and the steady state*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Research Report No. 4, Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education, ED 089 603.

Leslie, L. L., & Johnson, G. P. (1974). *Equity and the middle class: On financing higher education*. Paper presented to the Seminar on Low Tuition, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.

Lombardi, J. (Summer, 1973). Critical decade for community college financing. *New Directions for Community Colleges: Meeting the Financial Crisis*, *1*(2), 109–120.

Lombardi, J. (1974a). *Faculty workload*. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 46. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, ED 097 925.

Lombardi, J. (1982). Moratorium on new junior colleges. *Junior College Research Review*, *6*(9), ED 061 928.

Lombardi, J. (1974b). *Reduction in force: An analysis of the policies and their implementation.* ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 48. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, ED 099 043.

Los Angeles Community College District. (December, 1974) *Courier, 21*(3), 3.

Magarell, J. (1975). State budgets: A state of shock—higher education appropriations seen sure to suffer. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 9*(20), 1–7.

Millett, J. D. (1974). *Politics and higher education.* University, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission. (December, 1974), *MHECC Report, 1*(10), 1.

Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Commission. (1974). *Projecting institutional enrollments 1974–1990.* St. Paul, MN.

National forum focuses on economic crises in education. (January, 1975). *College Board News, 3*(2), 1.

Nation's population put at 213.2 million. (January 1, 1975). *Los Angeles Times,* Part I, p. 32.

Neill, G. (1974). Washington report. *Phi Delta Kappan, 56*(4), 292.

Nebraska Legislature. (1971). *Legislative Bill No. 759.*

New England Board of Higher Education. (1974). *Student enrollment in New England institutions of higher education 1973–1974.* Wellesley, MA.

New national legislation is proposed for community-based education. (1975). *Community and Junior College Journal, 45*(6), 32–38.

Norris, J. S. (1975). The selling of the community college. *Community and Junior College Journal, 45*(6), 12–15.

Open door may close: Enrollment limit likely in Florida. (1975). *Chronicle of Higher Education, 10*(3), 7.

Opening fall enrollments 1972, 1973, and 1974. (1974). *Chronicle of Higher Education, 9*(13), 8.

Park, Y. (January, 1975). *Peralta college for non-traditional study.* Mimeographed Report. Berkeley, CA.

Parker C. A., & Vechitto, D. (Summer, 1973). A noncampus system for Vermont. *New Directions for Community Colleges: Meeting the Financial Crisis, 1*(2), 27–38.

Peck, R. D., & Lincicum, M. S. (1974). *Long-range enrollment trends for postsecondary education in Oregon.* Salem, OR: Educational Coordinating Council.

Peralta Colleges Bulletin. (December, 1974). *13*(6).

Polk, C. H., & Hendricks, V. L. (1975). Open-ended enrollment in adult education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 56*(6), 395.

Proportion of young men in college falls to lowest point since 1964. (1973). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *7*(22), 1.

Quie, A. H. (1975). Legislation for the new congress. *Community and Junior College Journal*, *45*(6), 30–31.

Ricklefs, R. (February 18, 1975). Changing courses: Squeezed for money, a number of colleges revamp curriculums. *Wall Street Journal*, p. 1.

Scully, M. G. (1974). Two-year colleges: The boom slows. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *9*(10), 1–6.

Shaffer, T. (February 14, 1975). Honeymoon over. Surveys show decline in marriages. *Los Angeles Times*, Part IV, p. 1

Shanker advocates educare, a lifelong education program. (1974). *Phi Delta Kappan*, *56*(4), 267.

Simon, K. A., & Frankel, M. M. (Eds.) (1973). *Projections of educational statistics to 1981–82*. 1972 Edition. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, Appendix B, p. 167.

Simon, K. A., & Grant, W. V. (Eds.) (1972). *Digest of educational statistics*. 1971 Edition. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

State of New Jersey, Department of Higher Education. (1974). *Community college finances 1974–75*. Trenton, NJ.

Suddarth, B. M., & Others. (1974). *Enrollment projections for Indiana postsecondary education 1974–1990*. Prepared for the Indiana Commission of Higher Education by the New York Management Division of the Academy for Educational Development, Inc.

Trombley, W. (March 24, 1974). Fraud, unethical acts in higher education called emerging crisis. *Los Angeles Time*, Part I, p. 22.

Trombley, W. (November 25, 1974). Vocational training of little benefit to most, study finds. *Los Angeles Times*, Part I, p. 1.

U.S. Marriages Decline. (March 7, 1975). *Los Angeles Times*, Part I, p. 22.

U.S. President's Commission on Higher Education. (1947). *Higher education for American democracy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van Dyne, L. (1974). A scholar's explosive memo. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *8*(37), 10–11.

Virginia's 23 community colleges enroll 53,523 students in fall. (Winter, 1974). *Virginia Community College System News*, p. 1.

Wattenbarger, J. L., & Others. (1970). *The community college: target population, program costs, and cost differentials*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida, Institute of Higher Education, ED 045 068.

Westline, J. G. (1974). *Enrollments in Oregon's public and independent colleges and universities: Actual and projected enrollments: 1966 through 1984*. Salem, OR: Educational Coordinating Council.

Wilson, R. (December 26, 1974). Boom years of 1960s are over: Kentucky's regional universities tackle task ahead. *Louisville Courier Journal, 239*(179), 1.

Winkler, K. J. (1974). States raise aid to students 25 percent. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 9*(9), 1.

Wygal, B. R., & Owen, H. J., Jr. (Summer, 1975). Planning a multi-campus district. *New Directions for Community Colleges: Reforming Academic Governance, 3*(2), 27–36.

Yarrington, R. (1969). *Junior colleges: 50 states/50 years.* Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Young, A. M. (June, 1973). The high school class of 1972: More at work, fewer in colleges. *Monthly Labor Review, 96*(6), 26–32.

Zwerling, L. S. (Autumn, 1974). Second-class education at the community college. *New Directions for Community Colleges: From Class to Mass Learning, 2*(3), 23–37.

Chapter 2

CRITICAL DECADE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCING

Until a decade ago financing the public education system seemed to be one of the more secure political activities of American life. The school ranked with the church and home as bulwarks of society. But during the last ten years public education has lost its grip on the American people—though the community college and other postsecondary institutions still attract millions of youngsters each September. Along with the loss of its high standing, education is suffering from a financial crisis. How this change came about still puzzles educators. Some believe that education is the scapegoat of taxpayers who are frustrated over their inability to influence other government agencies. But this is too simple an explanation, though it does have merit in calling attention to the greater susceptibility of education to adverse reaction of taxpayers as expressed in their rejection of tax overrides and bond issues.

The two phenomena, loss of esteem and penury, are related in time, but a direct cause and effect relationship does not necessarily exist. The financial crisis is too pervasive to be explained by a single cause. Some causes of the one (loss of esteem, for example) are similar to those of the other (penury); but other causes are unrelated.

Americans have been generous to education in recent decades: the proportion of the gross national product expended on education rose from 3.4 percent in 1930 to 7.7 percent in 1971. Expenditures for public higher education increased from .5 billion dollars in 1960 to 3.3 billion in 1971. This generosity made us inordinately expectant of ever-increasing appropriations. How much of our national resources should be allotted to education is difficult to determine. But one does not need extensive knowledge of economics to realize that the proportion of the gross national product going to education cannot increase indefinitely and that as it gets higher, resistance to greater increments increases.

Lombardi, John. "Critical Decade for Community College Financing," New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 1., No. 2, Summer 1973. John Lombardi, issue editor: "Meeting the Financial Crisis."

Comparing expenditures for education with those for luxury items or with the military is a futile exercise. For personal reasons in the first case and for presumed public security in the second, taxpayers give them a higher place than education. At one time in our history, education did have first priority on public funds, and in some states this principle is still embedded in the constitution. But now that twelve years of free schooling are almost universal and we approach universal access to postsecondary education, there is less urgency about maintaining this high priority. Other local and national concerns are crowding education for first demand on public money.

The Golden Age and After

During the 1950s and early 1960s, community college educators were absorbed in accommodating the tremendous enrollment increase: from slightly less than 600,000 students in 1960 to almost 3 million in 1972. Their energies were devoted to selecting sites, retaining architects, purchasing equipment, recruiting staffs, and putting together courses and curricula to take care of the seemingly inexhaustible flow of students. They had little time to consider changes in the technology of learning or in management. For the most part learning went on as it had been going on for decades and management changed even less. As long as budgets balanced, few were concerned with cost effectiveness, new learning techniques, or different housing patterns. During this same period, educators had little trouble convincing legislators to appropriate funds and taxpayers to vote for taxes.

The golden era of community college financing peaked in the mid-sixties. Governors, legislators, and taxpayers, burdened by demands for welfare, highways, police and fire protection, and pollution control, became less favorably disposed toward the large requests being made by educators. Yet the pressure for money continued. Costs kept rising as new and expanded functions and activities were thrust upon or developed by the colleges. Community services, outreach programs, costly vocational education programs, and large outlays to assist the disadvantaged pressed on the resources.

Thus, the seventies have become a critical decade for the two-year college, one in which it is facing its most serious crisis since the Great Depression. The mood seems to be one of guarded optimism. While they stress the need for more money, community college leaders are exploring other avenues out of their difficulties. Changes are taking place in management, learning, delivery patterns, and sources of funds. And as might be expected, progress is uneven.

Finding new directions will include a great deal of soul searching. As our growth pattern slows, as our resources become more difficult to obtain, as students and the public question our claims of excellence, we are forced to examine our purposes, our goals and objectives, our methods of teaching, our management practices, our need for imposing buildings. These all impinge on finance. New dimensions in finance may be found in nearly every function and activity of the community college enterprise.

Sources of Funds

Some distinct trends are observable. Most pronounced is the shift away from the property tax toward greater reliance on state funds and tuition. The state's share of the colleges' revenues will increase; a minimum of 50 percent up to full state support (minus tuition and federal aid) is expected. Community college educators overwhelmingly favor this shift but have qualms about tuition, even though a majority of them probably support such student fees. Significant is the refusal of the AACJC 1972 Assembly to take a position on tuition, despite attempts by representatives from California and elsewhere to elicit a statement. Perhaps the tuition advocates are more realistic than the no-tuition supporters. Despite the hesitation of this vocal group in the assembly, one of the more certain predictions is that tuition will be higher and almost universal by the beginning of the next decade.

Federal aid, the hope for so many years, seems to be evaporating as President Nixon presses for the New Federalism and the dismantling of agencies and programs instituted under President Johnson's War to End Poverty. In fact, until President Nixon began his series of messages on the budget shortly after his reelection, educators seemed overly confident that massive doses of federal aid would relieve their financial distress. Confidence turned to despair as President Nixon disclosed his recommendations for lower appropriations and revenue-sharing as substitutes for categorical aid. Impoundment of appropriations, now on a small scale, threatens to become larger if Congress overrides presidential vetoes of traditional appropriations.

The future for larger federal appropriations is not bright. Huge yearly deficits and two devaluations of the dollar in as many years are formidable hurdles to gaining massive federal aid. And much of whatever aid is appropriated will be earmarked for student assistance and vocational education rather than for operational expenditures. Thus, solvency through federal aid, which seemed so near, now seems no nearer than a distant star.

Still in the gestation stage but with considerable future potential is the private sector as a source of funds. Foundations for soliciting and managing donations are sprouting in many colleges. Community college educators are well advised to seek donations from private sources. These efforts may appear to compete with the desperately hard-pressed independent junior colleges but in reality they do not, because so many potential donors are local citizens who want to be associated with their college or business people who depend on the colleges for trained personnel. Additionally, the distinction between the two types of colleges is narrowing; the independents are getting increasing amounts of state and federal aid. Much work remains to be done in this area, however, since private donations to community colleges are usually designated for capital purposes—land, buildings, equipment—and for scholarships and loans. Donations for operating expenditures are inconsequential.

The President's Commission on the Financing of Post-Secondary Education and other similar groups will soon be suggesting various long-term solutions to the problem of finding support for postsecondary education. With the alternatives presented will come suggestions for uniform financing methods, which will have the effect of reducing the present diversity. Wherever state financing has superseded local financing, uniformity has increased; if federal aid should ever supply the 15 to 20 percent of total revenues sought by educators, uniformity will become national. However, for the next few years, this possibility is extremely remote; in fact, educators are in shock as President Nixon's New Federalism unfolds. If revenue-sharing for education should be adopted by Congress, they will lose their most favored issue—federal control.

Effects of Public Policy

While administrators and faculty try to bring income and outlay in balance, the colleges are given new tasks that impinge on finance. Public policy required community colleges to "recognize the need and accept the responsibility for extending the opportunities for community college education to all who may profit therefrom regardless of economic, social, and educational status" (*California Education Code*, Chapter 3, Division 18.5, Section 25524). Essentially, this refers to members of minority groups and other disadvantaged people who heretofore have not enrolled in numbers comparable with their percentage of the total population. Although state and federal governments provide incentives, they never equal the total costs needed to fulfill this new dimension.

As a result of this emphasis, slowly but surely community colleges are becoming dispensers of social welfare. The categorical nature of the grants often requires multiplication of staff and clerical personnel in addition to student tutors, counselors, and recruiters. This has been dubbed the "medicare effect"; that is, the lion's share of federal and state subsidies goes to overhead rather than to students (Brewster, 1973).

The simple procedures formerly used in dispensing scholarship grants no longer suffice; the financial aid office has become a sizable organization, identifying, recruiting, and assisting those handicapped by language, social, physical, and economic disabilities. Operationally, this office has many of the features of a welfare agency. A student seeking aid is required to complete a variety of forms attesting to his need and submit his or his parents' notarized income tax statement verifying his dependent or independent (emancipated) status. Now appearing with frequency are charges of misappropriation of funds, calls for audits, default on repayment of loans, and falsification of forms. Unlike students in the senior institutions, community college students have not made much use of loans, partly for the reasons mentioned in the Harris article.

Another public priority that affects budget-balancing is that given to vocational-technical education. Community college educators are urged to increase the proportion of vo-tech students to at least 50 percent of those enrolled and to improve the effectiveness of training that leads to employment. Again, financial incentives are provided but are usually not equal to the extra costs involved.

Still another development that will influence the future of public colleges is the emerging policy that the state has a responsibility for the welfare of private colleges. Since public funds are insufficient for the needs of the public colleges, this new policy could mean less money for these postsecondary institutions. Associated with this development is the pressure to close the tuition gap between private and public colleges. If tuition in public colleges should approach that in private/independent colleges, the advantage of the former will disappear and enrollment may decrease, raising other immediate financial problems—although, in the long run, fewer students in the public colleges may ease the financial situation.

Population trends also bear on finance. If zero population growth materializes, the slowdown in college enrollment will be intensified toward the end of the century. With a lower potential supply of students, colleges can look forward to financial relief—provided that legislators and taxpayers fund their operations more adequately than they are doing today.

The future of the community colleges will reflect the change from exhilarating expansion, seen in buildings and computed in increasing numbers of students, to depressing contraction during which energies must be directed to less spectacular internal alterations in curriculum, learning, management, and personnel. The age of accountability has opened as legislators and taxpayer groups are asking, "How are educators spending our money?" The attempts to answer give rise to new procedures—cost effectiveness studies, management by objectives, development of information systems and data banks, new budgeting methods, institutional research, management education. Cost control becomes an overriding concern.

Changes in Instruction and Management

Fraught with serious difficulties are the new approaches to conserving resources through improved management techniques, changes in the technology of teaching and learning, and experimentations in nontraditional delivery systems. Efforts to introduce cost effectiveness intensify the division between faculty and administrators and may accelerate the movement toward trade unionism. Mention of cost effectiveness brings up the spectre of the application of business methods to learning—a prospect that instructors claim will dehumanize learning just as the assembly-line techniques dehumanized industrial production. They charge that Taylorism—the process of simplifying, compartmentalizing, and placing jobs under continuous supervision—will bring to education the same alienation it has brought to the auto industry. Yet cost effectiveness cannot be ignored.

Since academic salaries commonly account for 50 to 65 percent of educational expenditures, a good deal of legislative attention is given to faculty work loads. In defense, faculty are increasing their drive for unionization and collective bargaining. They are supporting those candidates for public office who promise to give favorable consideration to their requests for shorter hours and smaller classes—the two ingredients in work load. The contention that smaller work loads may lead to a reduced number of positions, if financial stringency continues, does not carry much weight with the faculty, since they are convinced that lower work loads mean excellence in teaching. Some colleges not yet constrained by collective bargaining agreements are managing to cut costs by maintaining faculty work loads one and a half to two times heavier than those in colleges with union contracts. And contrary to what one might suppose, most of the changes in learning and teaching procedures are taking place in these schools rather than in colleges where lighter loads prevail.

Improving educational management is receiving almost as much attention as improving instruction. PPBS, management by objectives, management information systems, and institutional research crowd the educationally oriented subject matter in professional journals and at conferences and seminars.

Changes in management are taking place but probably with no more speed or enthusiasm than changes in instructional technology. Budgetmaking, the heart of the financial operation, has been streamlined somewhat through PPBS and other less extensive reforms. With these new budget procedures, balancing income and expenditures becomes more rational, less dependent on across-the-board or piecemeal, temporary adjustments that often just delay the difficult realignments necessary for long-term financial well-being. Budget procedures do not create the economies; they provide administrators with information that enables them to cut back or excise weak programs and to bolster healthy programs. Through improved budget guidelines and greater staff participation changes have a reasonable chance of being accepted.

No-campus Experiments

Still in an experimental stage are colleges without campuses. Whatcom Community College in Washington and the statewide Community College of Vermont dispense with the traditional campuses in favor of rented facilities throughout the area served. Well-established colleges are also reaching out into the community, conducting classes and providing services in rented facilities instead of creating additional campuses. *Satellite campus*, a new term replacing *branch campus*, is not just a new name for an old institution; it refers to learning and community services units set up in rented facilities in distant, sparsely settled areas of a district or in those areas whose potential students are not likely to enroll at the main campus. If successful, the Whatcom and Vermont experiments will not only save money, they will prove that an imposing campus is not a necessary attribute of a community college.

Private Colleges

For the private, independent colleges, the new directions are not toward a revival or renaissance. More than any other sector of education, they have suffered from the competition of the no- or low-tuition community colleges that have been lavishly supported by local, state, and federal funds. Here are the forgotten institutions of modern times. Much has been written on the importance of rescuing private higher (university) education and elementary and secondary schools but very little concern has been expressed for the survival of the private junior colleges. The disappearance of eighty-nine colleges in the past twenty-five years has not caused a ripple, so entranced has the public been with the spectacular increase in community colleges. The dramatic rise of these schools, with its focus on the goal of universal higher education, has so completely overshadowed the private colleges that most people hardly know of their existence.

Look at the figures. In 1948, the 328 private/independent college exceeded the public colleges by four. Yet by 1971, the respective numbers were 239 private and 872 public. Enrollment in the public colleges rose from 25 percent of the total in 1915 to 95 percent in 1971; 137,000 private college students versus 2.7 million public college students. The average enrollment of the twelve private colleges that closed in 1968 was 62 per institution while the five that became four-year colleges had an average enrollment of 1,125. Thus, the small colleges go out of existence and the larger colleges seek survival by upward mobility. The situation for many of the survivors is desperate, living as they do within the cold shadow of the publicly supported colleges. Yet a few continue to prosper.

As with the public institutions, hope for the private/independent junior colleges depends largely on state (and possibly federal) support. Change of policy is on its way but unless it is accelerated, the financial crisis may do irreparable damage. A much greater effort must be made to tell the public why these colleges are worthy of its support. Their survival for close to one hundred years in the face of the tremendous impetus given to community colleges by all levels of government says a great deal for their vitality and their ability to meet the needs of students—albeit a small number.

Prospects

Will the new trends in finance break the crisis situation that has confronted community college educators since early in the 1960s? The prospects do not seem auspicious. The national financial situation offers so little on which to pin one's hope. One must be an inveterate optimist to believe that two devaluations in fourteen months and huge yearly deficits are signs of national well-being. Yet so many educators had looked to federal aid as the way out of their financial plight, and many still do, despite the evidence that the authorizations do not materialize in actual appropriations. President Nixon's economic policy may be more realistic than the congressional policy of incurring larger deficits.

Revenue-sharing is bringing some relief to cities, counties, and states; but it is dawning on state and local officials that revenue-sharing may be just a substitute for, not an addition to, money that formerly went to health, welfare, education, and transportation. College educators may find that they too will receive less money if revenue-sharing replaces the present method of supplying federal aid.

The new directions in financing will not be a replay of the glowing predictions for the future made a few years ago. Neither need they be a prophecy of doom. Educators will have to make adjustments to changing conditions, to retrench rather than expand. The private/independent junior college educators have been adjusting for a long time and a few community college educators have had a taste of it for the past two or three years, but the majority have yet to face the pruning and reshaping that will be necessary.

Many educators expect or hope for a return of the "good old days" of the early 1960s. But as a 1973 California Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education reports, this is a questionable assumption. Also questioned are beliefs that a change in state and federal administrations will bring about a return to affluence; that every college campus should be comprehensive and self-sufficient; that low or no tuition serves the poor; and that educational institutions are the best locus of teaching and learning.

Community colleges do have financial problems, certainly, but they are not yet severe enough to require major curtailment of educational services. Though governors and legislatures are more tight-fisted than they used to be, they still provide sizable sums—and a few are increasing appropriations. Some states are directing more student aid funds to the community colleges in order to help minorities and disadvantaged students and also to encourage others to enroll in the community colleges rather than in the four-year colleges and universities. State policies designed to provide a community college within reasonable commuting distance of all potential students will ensure considerate—though not necessarily generous—treatment of the colleges' financial needs.

New directions in finance are predicated on the belief that there is a way out of the financial distress now affecting community colleges. But the new directions point inward as well as outward. It is, of course, easier to seek relief from taxpayers or students than from increased productivity, better management, and less imposing edifices. But the taxpayers have become reluctant, and increasing fees and tuition may be counterproductive. Moreover, excessive dependence on augmented funds to relieve each crisis may become a ritual of self-absolution which inhibits us from seeking other, perhaps more basic, causes for our troubles. We do need more money, but we are deceiving ourselves if we believe more money by itself will be a panacea or create a distinguished institution.

References

Brewster, K., Jr. "The Study Ethic," *Newsweek*, *81*, 1973, p.11.

Chapter 3

FACULTY WORKLOAD

Faculty workload receives intermittent attention by faculty, administrators, governors, legislators and economists. During the 1950s the faculty and their professional organizations called attention to what they considered unreasonable workloads—workloads that were derived, with modifications, from high school practices—and strived for limits on the maximum that could be assigned. State guidelines as well as accrediting association standards tended to place a maximum on teacher loads. But in the 1960s, as costs of education increased, as resistance to higher taxes grew, and as college finances deteriorated, attention to faculty workload came primarily from administrators, governors, legislators and economists. Asserting that higher education cannot continue indefinitely as a highly labor-intensive enterprise, they sought—and continue to seek—minimum loads for the staff. Whether or not, as they claim, the ultimate solution for restoring the colleges' financial health depends on an increase in faculty workload, they have claimed center stage.

Two major issues are apparent. One is quality versus quantity, the other is change versus insolvency. Faculty and other educators contend quality will be sacrificed if higher workloads are imposed; the proponents for change challenge this contention and warn that financing education under the normal classroom methods will lead to collapse on a wide scale.

This essay reviews various aspects of faculty workload with emphasis on definitions of workload and on major problems in developing workload formulas. Attention will also be directed to the erosion of parietal policies, the quality versus quantity issue, and the effect of collective bargaining on workloads.

Lombardi, John. *Faculty Workload*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper Number 46, October 1974.

Definition of Workload

In its broadest aspect "faculty load is the sum of all activities which take the time of a college . . . teacher and which are related either directly or indirectly to his professional duties, responsibilities and interest" (Stickler, 1960). Foremost among these activities are classroom teaching assignments, including preparation of lessons, making and correcting examinations, advising students, selecting texts, library books, and audiovisual materials, and revising courses. In the community college these comprise 90 percent or more of an instructor's time. Other duties may include membership on college and advisory committees, attendance at faculty and other institutional ceremonial meetings, sponsorship of a group such as a club, forensics, band, choir, theater production, or athletic team. Another feature of faculty workload is the amount of time other than for classroom assignments that an instructor must spend on campus.

Workload policies frequently incorporate provisions regarding which duty assignments are part of the instructor's normal responsibilities and which classify as overload assignments requiring some form of extra compensation. Those activities such as coaching a debate or athletic team, directing a play, conducting a band, choir, or orchestra which involve fixed time demands are frequently classified as overload, and are compensated by a reduction in regular load or by extra pay. Adjustments in workload are often made for assignments with unusual demands such as teaching a new course, serving on a major college committee, or preparing instructional materials.

For most instructors the important factors are the number of credit or contact hours assigned per week and the number of students in each class. For those instructors engaged in a supervisory or teaching capacity in open learning laboratories, television, independent study, work experience and other methods of teaching and learning, the WSCH unit of measurement is replaced or supplemented by other measures. Weekly Student Contact Hours is a measure of the number of students an instructor meets per class hour times the number of hours per week he meets them. In practice it varies widely—from as low as 200 to as high as 1,000 or more, with a normal range of 250 to 700. In some collective bargaining agreements with maximum class size restrictions the range is much narrower and the maximum is usually about 400. With increasing frequency a workload that is greater than normal in terms of weekly contact hours or number of students in class results in overload compensation for the instructor.

Credit hours are not always equal to contact or class hours. A credit hour in a subject that requires outside preparation for the instructor or the student is equal to one contact hour. A credit hour in a laboratory shop or performance class that requires no outside preparation is equal to one-half to three-fourths of a contact hour. In a few subjects, particularly English composition or writing classes, a credit hour is worth approximately one and one-third contact hours. This difference between credit and contact hours has led to faculty insistence that workloads be defined in terms of contact hours rather than credit hours. In practice, workloads rarely exceed twenty-five contact hours regardless of which unit is used.

As a measuring rod the credit or contact hour lends itself to a variety of closely related administrative and financial uses. Originally developed to measure the amount of student work done or time spent in high school for college preparation, the credit hour was adopted as a unit for measuring faculty workload, allocating funds by the legislature and determining the cost of education. In general the credit hour unit is basic to the full-time student equivalent (FTSE) unit and full-time faculty equivalent (FTE). One FTSE is usually equivalent to 24 to 30 credit hours. A full time faculty equivalent represents 24 to 30 credit hours of teaching divided into two or three terms. Finally, since per capita cost is measured in terms of FTSE, the faculty workload is an important factor influencing the cost of education (Hicks, 1960). Under normal circumstances an increase in faculty workload has an immediate effect in lowering unit and total costs; conversely a reduction results in higher unit and total costs.

Second to contact hours in importance is class size as a measure of faculty workload. As with contact hours the size of a class may be weighted according to the subject, with the highest weight to English composition and speech among academic subjects and nursing clinical classes among the laboratory classes. At the other extreme are large performance classes in music and theater arts, appreciation classes in art and music, orientation classes, and physical education activity classes. Laboratory classes are usually limited in size to the number of student stations. Lecture classes exceeding fifty students are often given a higher weight depending upon the number of students above fifty. Less frequently, a small class below the normal size for the subject is weighted at less than one, thus requiring some extra assignment in terms of contact hours, non-classroom activity, or increase in class size in the other classes.

Credit or contact hours has greater significance to faculty than class size, because they are fixed time demands over which he has little control. Within limits the size of the class causes little concern since the time demands do not vary directly to the number of students. With the other activities making up his load the instructor has greater control in the time and energy he may wish to devote to them. Consequently, there is likely to be greater attention to weekly hours assigned than to the other variables when discussions on policy or negotiations on renewal of contracts take place.

Workload Formulas

Attempts have been made to develop load formulas that include all of the instructor's duties, recognizing that "the teacher normally spends far less time in the classroom than in preparation, conferences, grading of papers, and examinations, and supervision of remedial or advanced student work" (AAUP Bulletin, 1970). Yet, the formulas, especially when developed from information obtained through questionnaires completed by instructors, are of questionable value and have been characterized as amorphous, bulging and self-justifying (Enochs, 1960). In these formulas often adding up to 58 to 84 hours per week, Caplow points out "it is impossible to distinguish what is useful to the college and what is useful only to the individual, and what is useful to both" (1960). He wonders if practicing law or accounting or writing a text is engaged in to improve teaching or to supplement income.

Although workload formulas are interesting because they attempt to create a scientific basis for workload standards, the result, no matter what method is used, approximates the current practice in the number of teaching hours. In the 1950s 20 weekly contact hours was the norm so formulas usually worked out around 20 with a range of 15-25, reaching 30 in a few trade classes. Today's formulas yield a weekly class hour load between 12 and 18 hours. Thus, in a formula devised by Professor Lloyd N. Morrisett of the University of California in 1952 for Pasadena City College, English composition had a weighted value of 1.33; physical education activity 0.8. Since the normal teaching load under the Morrisett formulas was 20 hours per week, a teacher assigned composition classes, each meeting three hours a week, needed only five sections for a full load because 5 x 3 x 1.33 = 20. The actual hourly load was 15 for the English instructor and 25 for the physical education instructor.

Status of Faculty Workload

Almost universally, hourly loads are lower today than they were in the fifties and earlier, a phenomenon that is well documented and that antedates the era of collective bargaining. A Carnegie Commission study (1972) reported a decline in median teaching loads from 17.8–18.2 hours in 1931 to 15.1 hours in 1969. In California the average weekly hour load has gone down from a range of 18.2–29.6 in 1952 to 15–20 in 1972 (Contra Costa District, June 1953; Wagner, May 1972). The mean hour loads for 1966 and 1969 in Illinois went down from 16 to 14 (Martin and Thornblad, 1970). The Chicago Colleges and Onondaga College and Fashion Institute of Technology in

New York State have institution-wide 12 to 13 hour loads (McHugh and O'Sullivan, 1971).

The weekly student hour loads seem to have stabilized at the 12 to 16 hour range. Administrative resistance to lower hour loads has been strong. Changes in workloads are being effected in class size. In the traditional classroom teaching setting, the faculty have succeeded in reducing class size to a range of 20 to 50 with a mode of 30 to 35. However, by trading higher class size for lower weekly hours, large classes of 60 to 100 or more are becoming common. Some collective bargaining contracts and college policies contain formulas providing a scale equating weekly hours inversely to size. Under these formulas weekly hour loads can be reduced to one, theoretically, but rarely go below nine.

Objections to Quantitative Measurement of Workload

Faculty object strenuously to the practice of equating workload to quantitative criteria, particularly number of contact hours, student-faculty ratios, and average class size. They do not accept the assumption of legislators and administrators "that the costs to teachers for their services and the value to students of their learning both alike increase in direct proportion to the number of hours spent in the classroom" (Schellenberg, 1973). In fact they maintain that the converse is closer to the truth, that learning increases inversely to the number of hours spent in the classroom and the number of students in the class. Additionally, they view the use of credit or contact hours to measure workload and faculty workload formulas in general "as devices in the hands of management," (Bunnell, 1960) who presume "that students are little more than inanimate objects within a time and motion study" (*Read On*, 1972). To them, cost effectiveness is just another attempt "to reduce operating expenses at the cost of quality education" (Brightman, 1971).

Paradoxically, at the same time that they raise objections to the use of numerical units and formulas, faculty, either because they are not able to devise a better method or because the numerical formulas are so easy to apply, insist on incorporating them in contracts. All workload studies conducted by faculty groups and nearly every collective bargaining agreement use the contact or credit hour, average class size, and weekly student hours as the units of measurement in determining faculty workload. Even with all of its qualifications and caveats on quality the 1969 AAUP Statement of Faculty Workload (AAUP Bulletin, 1970) relies heavily on quantitative teaching hours per week as the measure of workload.

In community colleges it would be extremely difficult to avoid numerical qualitative measures in determining faculty workload, since the colleges' primary mission is teaching and measuring the quality of teaching has not gone beyond the testimonial stage. Although there has been a flurry of interest during the past five years or so on "accountability," measurement or evaluation of the quality of instruction and effectiveness of instructors has made little progress. Many legislators who passed laws recently for the improvement of instruction through evaluation of instructors are already expressing disappointment with the results.

Ignorance of how learning takes place and faculty resistance to merit rating are the two major obstacles to the development of qualitative measurement of instruction and instructor workload. Accordingly, administrators and legislators resort to measurement of the instructors' value to students and society by the number of hours they teach and the number of students in their classes. Actually, instructors object less to quantitative measures as such than to the amount that administrators and legislators consider a reasonable workload.

Parietal Regulations

A large number, probably the great majority, of college workload standards contain clauses requiring an instructor to schedule three to ten hours for student consultation and to spend five or six hours a day on campus, five days a week. These rules date back to the time when colleges were still closely associated with the high school, faculty loads were in the 20 to 30 plus hour range, and instructors were assigned a group of students as advisees, had to sign in and out each day and certify at the end of the week that they had met their classes, performed other duties, and spent the required number of hours per day and days per week on campus. In some states the principle from which these rules are derived was (and still is) included in the laws governing community colleges. Enforcement was relatively easy prior to 1950 since an instructor's absence from class was usually reported by students and the free time between classes was not long enough to permit extended absence from the campus.

Moonlighting is not a recent development in the community colleges. Many instructors have always supplemented their salaries by part-time teaching or by other employment, but nearly always during the evening hours, weekends or summer. In fact, colleges encouraged institutional moonlighting by giving day instructors preference to evening assignments, a practice that benefited the institutions, the instructors and the students. The college obtained the services of experienced instructors at rates of pay as low as one-half the day rates; the instructors had a ready source of extra pay for work that required very little extra preparation; and evening students received almost the same quality of instruction as day students. For the colleges the overtime pay may also have kept the faculty from making excessive demands for higher pay.

Teaching Load and Quality of Instruction

When state systems of community colleges were being formed in the 1950s and early 1960s legislatures and governing agencies set maximum rather than minimum workload standards. Typical are those for the professional staff of Illinois colleges stipulating that the normal teaching load in non-laboratory courses shall be no more than 16 semester or quarter hours, and "the ratio of professional staff to students shall permit a high degree of personal interaction" (Illinois Junior College Board, 1970). Aided by similar arguments that quality education goes with low teaching loads and the general belief that junior colleges can and should offer a more personalized atmosphere than the large universities, faculty have had only moderate difficulty in their drive for reduced weekly teaching hours and, to a lesser extent, for lower class size. So ingrained is this belief that even in the midst of a financial crisis a college president pointed out with satisfaction that the average number of weekly student contacts "is gradually being reduced to provide for *more effective* instruction and to approach the district recommended average of 450" (Horton, 1972).

In light of the strong tradition equating low or moderate workload with quality, administrators now face a formidable task in their efforts to increase the loads. The absence of criteria for measuring that quality has not diminished the fervor with which this belief is held. They must also contend with strong faculty organizations, college senates, and affiliates of state and national organizations that are determined to maintain or lower the present workload standards. Indirectly, the trend in business and industry toward the 35-hour and 25-hour workweek aids the faculty cause.

State legislators and governors have attacked the problem of increasing workload by mandating minimum workloads in terms of weekly credit or contact hours and/or student credit hours. Indirectly, others have used a faculty-student ratio to increase workloads. The former method is more direct but it leads to inflexibility since adjustments among departments and instructors are difficult to accomplish. The student-faculty ratio leaves a great deal of discretion to the college staffs in adjusting faculty workloads to meet special conditions.

Who Should Define Workload?

Accompanying the question of what is an adequate or proper teacher workload is a related issue: "Who should define the teacher load?" State legislatures and governing boards that prescribe a student-faculty ratio as a standard for instructor assignments influence workloads. While such a ratio gives the institution freedom to adjust instructor workloads depending on the method of instruction, class size, subject matter, or other factors influencing assignments, the ratio places a limit on the number of instructors a college may employ. A seemingly small increase of a ratio from 17:1 to 20:1 reduces the number of instructors by nearly 18 percent. Thus the size of the ratio can influence not only the workload formulas but indirectly the programs a college will offer. Departments with low student-faculty ratios may be restricted and even phased out if other departments are unable or unwilling to increase their student-faculty ratios to produce the minimum average.

Within the limits set by state laws and state administrative regulations faculty are participating in the initial determination and subsequent reappraisal of workloads as recommended by the 1969 AAUP Statement on Faculty Workload. The AAUP recommendation of full participation is achieved most closely in colleges operating under collective bargaining. A serious confrontation developed in Michigan when the legislature set minimum workloads for the various segments, but this involved primarily the universities which successfully claimed that the legislature had no jurisdiction over a university established by the constitution. Community colleges, however, as creatures of the legislature, could not make such a claim. Though the legislature lost in the university case, it had the last word when it came to appropriating funds. And herein lies its strongest weapon, the power of the purse, a lesson that is not lost on faculty organizations. If a confrontation should develop between a faculty organization and the colleges on a workload issue the legislature, with public support, could force a change. Faculty organizations counter this by supporting legislative candidates who favor their cause. With friendly legislators and aid from lobbyists of other public employee groups, the faculty have been successful in preventing drastic changes in current workloads.

New Workloads for New Teaching Technologies

The widespread introduction of new teaching methods and technologies has made it necessary to modify the faculty load formulas. In some cases this involves primarily a reduction in contact hours to compensate for larger than normal class size; in others the usual load formulas do not apply. A few illustrations will indicate the changes that are being made.

Loads for television instructors deviate markedly from the common workload formula. Not even the Weekly Student Contact Hours is a factor since its size in television classes goes far beyond anything envisaged in the formulas for classroom or auto-tutorial instructional methods. Class size has little meaning; the expectation is that many hundreds of students will enroll and other hundreds will view the program without enrolling. Moreover, once produced, a videotaped lecture may be repeated many times, which raises questions involving the instructor's residual rights. Other questions arise when tapes are offered for sale to or exchanged with other colleges.

No uniform load formula has been developed for televised courses. In general an instructor assigned to the production of a video tape is relieved of all classroom duties during the semester or year that it may take to prepare and produce the lectures or demonstrations. During the semester the video tape is broadcast, the instructor may be awarded a number of contact hours for the purpose of evaluating and recommending changes in the production.

For most television courses additional instructors are assigned to supply supporting services to the large number of students enrolled. These instructors, called supporting instructors or facilitators, conduct scheduled on-campus class sessions, maintain office hours for personal and telephone interviews, administer midterm and final examinations, grade papers, and perform other duties relating to the needs of students or requirements of the course.

In summing up this brief discussion of new workload formulas, several observations are in order. Except in minor instances not much change in the labor-intensive characteristic of teaching has taken place. Probably, greater faculty productivity is accomplished through an increase in class size in the traditional classroom pattern than in the use of new forms of teaching-learning methods. Nevertheless, the potential of the new forms for changing the labor-intensive characteristics and workload patterns remains as illustrated in the examples cited.

Summary and Conclusion

During the pre-World War II period teacher load policy was developed by administrators with little faculty participation. Since the colleges were governed by the same boards that governed the high schools it is not surprising that the junior college instructor's load in academic subjects was only slightly lower than that of the high school teacher. In the technical, industrial, trade and physical education areas the teaching load closely approximated the 25 to 30 hour weekly load of high school teachers.

After World War II the situation changed slowly at first but more rapidly as the colleges began to separate from the public school system, as more became members of the regional accrediting associations of higher education, and as enrollments soared. Faculty members through their local and state associations exercised a great deal of influence on workloads. The trend was and continues to be in the direction of loads comparable to those in the four-year colleges.

Faculty workloads by the 1970s reached their lowest level in the history of the community college. Not only have the weekly contact hours been reduced from an average range of 20 to 25 to 12 to 16, but the number of extra duties formerly required have been reduced or where performed are reimbursed through a reduction in contact hours or extra pay. Class size does not show the same reduction, since class size has a direct relationship to college enrollment. In addition, class size is often increased in return for a reduction in weekly contact hours. In small colleges, as the great majority were until the 1940's the average class size was low; as the colleges grew the class size increased. By 1953 the median for 23 California junior colleges was 21.9 with a range of the average class size of 13.6 to 29.7. The WSCH median was 429 with a range of the average WSCH of 301 to 549. Today, the median for class size and WSCH does not differ significantly from this except in colleges experimenting with large class instruction, an indication of the greater flexibility of class size than of contact hours (Contra Costa Junior College District, 1953).

Workloads for instructors teaching in auto-tutorial laboratories, television, and large forum-type classes have not yet been standardized. Colleges in which the new technologies of teaching have been introduced are experimenting with various patterns, usually modifications of the workloads common for instructors teaching in conventional classrooms. If adopted widely instructors will become television actors, managers of paraprofessionals and technicians and/or producers of course units and selectors of equipment.

Some colleges have increased productivity through these new technologies but the great majority have not. The new teaching technologies have not produced the reduced costs many administrators had expected. Capital costs, excessive released time for instructors, low enrollment, large expenses for development or purchase of instructional programs and materials and for technicians overcome whatever savings may be made in lower teacher costs.

Probably, greater savings are being made by colleges that convince instructors to add a few students to each class than by colleges using the new technologies. However, the potential for converting education from a labor-intensive to a capital-intensive enterprise is great as is evident at Orange Coast (California) College.

The major influence on workload for the future will be the relative bargaining strength of the employee and employer negotiators. What happens in colleges with collective bargaining agreements also influences workload standards in colleges without such agreements. Appeals that financial survival depends upon some modest improvement in productivity do not impress faculty unless the crisis is immediate and likely to result in a reduction in force.

Much discussion on workload relates to its effect on quality of instruction. Hard data proving or disproving any relationship does not exist. Up to now consensus seems to be that class size has little influence on student learning; although there may be some effect on instructor fatigue and student preference and satisfaction. The number of weekly contact hours under today's workload formulas seems to have even less bearing on the issue. The spread of moonlighting made possible by lighter hour loads raises questions regarding the argument that lower hourly workloads are needed to enable instructors to do a better job of teaching.

If one may hazard a prediction in the normal classroom pattern of teaching it is unlikely that workloads will increase much above 15 weekly contact hours or that they will decrease below the twelve weekly contact hour base achieved institution-wide by the faculties of the Chicago City Colleges and several colleges in New York State and by a large number of English composition instructors in other colleges.

Class size will continue to fluctuate widely. Whereas the weekly hour load is usually specified in a contract or policy, the class size may be left for determination by the dean of instruction with provisions for faculty discussion and modification as at Moraine Valley College (Illinois) or limited by existing practice as at Henry Ford (Michigan). The average seems to hover around 35 students with a range of 25 to 50. Where large class sizes are accepted the hour load of instructors teaching such classes may be as low as nine and in a few instances, six.

It is also apparent that a large number of colleges are giving up the requirement that instructors spend a specified number of hours on campus whether or not they have scheduled classes. Less frequently colleges are relaxing rules limiting the instructor's freedom to engage in paid activity during the school week, evenings, and/or weekends. Even where such parietal rules are still retained, administrators may ignore violations, except in flagrant cases involving a conflict with class assignments or violation of a state law. It is unlikely that the labor-intensive characteristic of education will change significantly during the coming years.

References

AAUP Bulletin. (1970). Statement on faculty workload. 34(1), 30–32.

Brightman, R. W. (1971). *Strategies for change: Case studies of innovative practices at the Coast Community Colleges District.* Costa Mesa, CA: Office of Educational Development, Orange Coast College.

Bunnel, K. (Ed.). (1960). *Faculty work load: A conference report.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Caplow, T. (1960). The dynamics of faculty load, study. In K. Bunnel (Ed.). *Faculty work load: A conference report.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1972). *The more effective use of resources: An imperative for higher education.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Contra Costa Junior College District. (1953). *Survey of teacher load in California junior colleges.* First semester—1952–1953.

Enochs, J. B. (1960). Problems of defining faculty load. In K. Bunnel (Ed.). *Faculty work load: A conference report.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Hicks, J. W. (1960). Faculty work load—an overview. In K. Bunnel (Ed.). *Faculty work load: A conference report.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Horton, R. (1972). *Report to the faculty.* Los Angeles: Los Angeles Valley College.

Illinois Junior College Board. (1970). *Standards and criteria for the evaluation and recognition of Illinois public junior colleges and other guidelines, policies and procedures approved by the Illinois Junior College Board: Revised.* Springfield, IL.

Martin, A. H., & Thornblad, C. E. (Eds.). (1970). *Report of selected data and characteristics of Illinois public junior colleges, 1969–70.* Springfield, IL: Junior College Board.

McHugh, W. F., & O'Sullivan, R. (1971). *New York community college collective negotiation contract survey.* Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Read On. (18 April, 1972). *1*, pp. 1–2.

Schellenberg, J. (1965). The class hour economy. *Harvard Educational Review, 35*, 163.

Stickler, W. H. (1960). Working material and bibliography on faculty load. In K. Bunnel (Ed.). *Faculty work load: A conference report.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Wagner, L. (1972). The economics of the open university. *Higher Education, 1*, 159–183.

Chapter 4

THE AMBIGUITY OF THE PART-TIME FACULTY

Overview

Part-time, substitute, adjunct, supplemental instructors have multiplied almost as fast as part-time students. Responsible for this phenomenon are the decline in the rate of enrollment growth, the straitened financial condition of many colleges, and the growth of off-campus, outreach, weekend and evening programs. The proliferation of the day part-time and other non-regular instructors is causing concern to many groups—the full-time faculty, the leaders of professional organizations, and college administrators, each of which has its own interest in this new development. Controversy over the employment of part-time instructors has led to legislative inquiries, bills to restrict the practice, and surveys to find out its extent.

Prior to 1965 the issues revolved around pay and, to a lesser extent, the rights of regular day instructors to the extra-pay or overload assignments. Since then others have come to the fore. Pay is still the major issue but causing as much difficulty are issues relating to the number of day part-time instructors and their proportion to full-time instructors, their inclusion or exclusion as members of the bargaining unit where collective bargaining exists, and their rights and responsibilities in the department and in the college.

There is, of course, the very personal interest of the part-time instructors whose assignments are for fixed periods with no assurance of continuity and at a rate of pay far below that of the regular full-time instructors. At the other extreme are the administrators who created the problem because:

Lombardi, John. *Part-Time Faculty in Community Colleges*, Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper Number 54, December 1975.

- they were confronted with serious budgetary limitations particularly during the late 1960's;
- they saw the savings possible in hiring part-time instead of full-time instructors;
- they needed to tap new sources of instructors with special skills for regular or experimental programs that had a high probability of low enrollment or uncertainty of success, not justifying commitments for full-time instructors;
- during the teacher shortage of the 1950's and early 1960's they had to recruit instructors who were willing to undertake a part-time assignment but not a full-time (Heinberg, 1966);
- it is an "efficient way of dealing with sudden shifts in enrollments" (Scully, 1975).

Between the part timers and the administrators are the full-time faculty members whose interests range from an idealistic concern for the welfare of the part-time instructors to the selfish protection of their own priority rights to part-time overload assignments and the raising of their pay for these assignments to parity with their regular scale.

For many part timers these issues are not important. This group includes those with special skills who have full-time jobs outside the college, and teach a class or two during the evening with only minor responsibility outside the class assignment. They are not interested in governance on the departmental or college level. They get their satisfaction from being associated with a collegiate institution, performing in an occupation that still commands respect from a large segment of the population, and particularly, in sharing their special talents with others. The unconcerned group also includes those full-time faculty members who do not care for extra-pay assignments and who show little interest in any activity beyond their classroom duties.

But the majority of full-time and part-time instructors are involved. The former, whether or not they teach overload classes, have concerns touching on priority to overload assignments, the proportion of day part-time instructors to full-time, their qualifications, the quality of their services, their role in the governance of the department, their status as members of the bargaining unit and their rate of pay. The part timers on the other hand have a greater economic interest in the issues than any other group. They depend on the part-time assignment for part of their livelihood; some must work at two or more colleges in order to earn the equivalent of the lowest paid full-time instructor, usually without fringe benefits. Many of them want fringe benefits, and continuous assignment along with such intangibles as participation in departmental and college affairs, office space, inclusion by name in the schedule of classes, and parking privileges. Many accept a part-time assignment and/or they believe that a part-time assignment increases their chances of obtaining a full-time job at the same college or at another college. Part-time teaching gives them experience, frequently a prerequisite for appointment to a full-time position. As Phair points out, experience is important in seeking a full-time staff job in a restricted labor market, for "many of the new full-time staff hired (in California colleges) show a background of teaching at the community college level on a part-time basis. . . . Colleges have been hiring part-time staff in large numbers for so many years that the bloc of experienced community college people are making an ever-increasing and successful assault on vacancies for full-time staff positions" (Phair, 1974).

On some of the issues the full-time and part-time instructors are in accord; on others they are on opposite sides. One must always keep in mind that the dichotomy between full-time and part-time instructors is not sharply delineated since many full timers also take part-time assignments. In fact, statistics on the number and proportion of part-time teachers on a college staff usually include everyone with a part-time assignment whether or not they are full-time instructors. Accordingly, at times in this discussion it will be necessary to focus on part-time *teaching* rather than part-time *teachers* because many full-time instructors engage in part-time teaching on an overload assignment basis. Obviously, full-time instructors who also teach overload do not have problems relating to status and privileges since they carry all of the prerequisites of their regular position (but not necessarily the pay) to their part-time positions.

For the outsiders who are part timers the situation is far different in this respect. They soon learn if they did not know it earlier, that although full-time instructors insist on a large measure of self-governance in their department or division they are not egalitarians. Neither are they philanthropists. They guard their priority privilege to evening overload assignments even though by asserting it, part-time instructors are displaced. Part-time instructors have little, if any, say in departmental matters, course content, curriculum development, or textbook selection. They are the first to go in economy moves dictated by enrollment declines or drop in income. In recent years faculty organization leaders have tried to ameliorate these conditions but the task is not simple. Tenure and seniority are assets that cannot be easily modified without antagonizing the full-time instructors. A few colleges have solved this problem by hiring only regular full-time instructors for day and evening or by eliminating overload assignments for full-time instructors.

Faculty organization leaders have some serious concerns with the multiplication of part-time instructors, particularly those employed during the day. In the first place, because of the large numbers of part-time instructors, they are ambivalent about admitting them to membership in their organization. The increased financial contribution part-time instructors' dues would make must be balanced against the prospect of the organization being taken over by the more numerous part timers. In the second place, part-time instructors pose a threat to the full-time instructors—not only do they teach at a lower rate of pay, they are more amenable to administrative direction, less able to resist demands for greater productivity in terms of class size, and they constitute a source of replacements in case of a strike. As a practical matter, many organization leaders are accepting part-time instructors as members while working to reduce their numbers in the college by contractual provisions.

Part-Time Workloads

Almost universally colleges prescribe limits on the number of hours per week and/or on the number of courses a part-time instructor may teach. These rules apply to regular full-time instructors and part-time instructors not otherwise affiliated with the college. The practice of limiting part-time assignments has existed for a long time. Where formerly these limits were established unilaterally by administrators or by state boards, lately they have become the subject of bargaining between faculty representatives and administrators. Collective bargaining agreements often contain a section dealing with workloads for part-time instructors and for full-time instructors with an overload assignment. These limits may be from one hour per week to the number of hours that does not "exceed a full-time teacher's contractual limitations" (Macomb County Community College, 1972) or "one course in which the credit hour does not exceed five" (Illinois Junior College Board, 1971). Most of the agreements limit each instructor to one or two classes averaging two to six hours per week. Frequently, full-time instructors are limited to one additional class or three hours per week (Waubonsee Community College, 1973-1975); rarely are they permitted more than two classes or six hours. There is understandably more variation on the upper limits for part-time instructors not otherwise employed by the college.

Because of recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions, restrictive state laws, and collective bargaining agreements, most work loads of untenured part-time teachers will remain in the low range of four to seven hours per week. Administrators are reluctant to assign more than one or two classes when by doing so the part-time instructors gain job security and/or must be paid proportionately the same salary as a full-time instructor with the same qualifications and years of experience. For many part-time instructors the limits impose no hardship since they do not have the time or energy to undertake more. But for those without supplemental employment the limit does present a handicap.

Number of Part-Time Instructors

Despite the increased interest in part-time instructors, statistics on their number and proportion are spotty and difficult to interpret, a condition that results from the different definitions of part-time instructors. One cannot usually tell from the data how many of the part-time instructors have no other assignments with the college and how many have full-time assignments (not necessarily teaching) at the same college, a different college, or in a non-educational establishment. There is even less information on the number of part-time instructors who have part-time assignments at two or more colleges.

Notwithstanding these problems in data reporting, the trend in the employment of part-time instructors has been upward since the early 1960's and has accelerated sharply during the last three years. In 1962 the National Education Association Research Division reported that part-time instructors comprised 38.5 percent of the instructors in 698 junior colleges (Heinberg, 1966). By 1971 the percentage had increased moderately to 40 but by 1974 the percentage had grown to 49.7. The increase in number of part-time instructors is even more impressive—from 11,530 in 1962 to 48,855 in 1971 and 80,257 in 1974. By 1974 there were more part-time than full-time instructors in at least 16 states (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974).

Statistics on the number of part-time instructors in the two-year colleges confirm that they have become the majority of instructors. While the great majority of part-time instructors are still found in the late afternoon and evening classes, a significant number are teaching during the day. The growth of the latter practice is causing the greatest concern among the faculty and their organizations and also among the part-time instructors who feel they are being exploited by the administrators in the tight job market of the last five years. Today's glut of instructors is in contrast to their scarcity during the 1950's and 1960's when interest in the employment of part-time instructors was also high albeit for different reasons. As long as administrators are not constrained by law or collective bargaining agreements they will continue to employ lower paid part-time instructors, probably in larger numbers than in the past, as one means of effecting savings.

Control on Part-Time Employment

Provisions to control the number of part-time instructors teaching day classes appear frequently in state laws and in collective bargaining agreements. Most are still in the nature of a policy of intent, but some are restrictive. Illustrative of a generalized policy that gives the administrator considerable latitude is the Maryland standard that "A substantial portion of the course work should be taught by full-time faculty members" (Maryland State Department of Education, 1969). In collective bargaining agreements the controls are usually more explicit. The Macomb County Community College (Michigan) contract states that "The Board shall not seek the employment of part-time teachers for the purpose of reducing the number of professional staff by replacing full-time teachers except when a full-time teacher has been given a leave of absence." Moreover, "no part-time teacher may be given assignments that exceed a full-time teacher's contractual limitations" (1972). These are further defined as 22 equated hours annually, 16 equated hours during the academic year and nine equated hours during one trimester. The Wisconsin Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education District 4 statement is prescriptive: "Whenever there is sufficient teaching load in a full-time program, the Board will employ a full-time instructor rather than several part-time teachers" (Madison Area Technical College, 1973). Similar provisions appear in contracts at Hutchinson Community Junior College (1973) and Schenectady Community College (1972-1975). Most of the above regulations apply to part-time day positions, not necessarily to evening division or special short- or limited-term assignments.

Another method of discouraging the employment of part-time instructors is to remove the most powerful incentive for the practice—lower pay. This is done by requiring that those teaching a certain percentage of a full load be paid at the regular salary schedule rates prorated to the percentage of time taught—35 percent at Minnesota Junior College (1973); 60 percent at Charles Stewart Mott Community College in Michigan (1973-75); 12 hours at Erie Community College, New York; eight hours at Henry Ford Community College, Michigan (1973-75).

A third method, incorporated in the Seattle Community College bargaining agreement, stipulates that "the part-time faculty headcount will be reduced by 20 percent by the Spring quarter, 1973" and that the percentage of reduction will be based upon the daytime part-time headcount of fall quarter 1971 (1972-73, p. 6). Similarly, by the terms of the Oakland Community College (Michigan) contract the number of part-time instructors is limited to 25 percent of the full-time faculty headcount (1973-75), while the Washtenaw Community College (Michigan) agreement places a limit of 40 percent of the full-time credit hours generated by the full-time faculty (1973-75).

While these efforts will retard the unprecedented growth of the past few years they will hardly eliminate the practice of employing part-time instructors. Even the full-time instructors would not wish to see this happen. For the administrators the non-financial advantages of hiring part timers still hold. Moreover, it is still less expensive to employ a part-time instructor even at *pro rata* pay for certain courses requiring special skills or having low enrollments than hiring a full-time instructor for whom it may be difficult to provide a normal load.

If *pro rata* pay is adopted more widely the effect may be for more rather than fewer part-time instructors since with *pro rata* pay comes more security for the instructor and probably *pro rata* tenure based on the proportion of a full load. Such part-time instructors will not be as prone as the untenured to give up their part-time employment. There will also be a greater inducement to seek such assignments by those who prefer part-time to full-time employment. With a large corps of such part-time instructors their influence on hiring practices may give unemployed teachers greater priority to part-time employment than they now possess.

A financial crisis or an enrollment decline will have a more immediate effect on lowering the number of part-time instructors than any of the restrictive devices proposed by faculty organizations. If the staff is reduced under either circumstance day part-time instructors are the first to be dropped from the staff followed by the evening part-time instructors.

Sources of Part-Time Faculty

The large numbers of part-time faculty come from five principal sources: day faculty, other colleges, K-12 schools, non-educational fields, recent university graduates. The proportion that comes from each source is influenced by the nature of the educational program, the location of the college, and the college policy on the number of overload units or classes a day an instructor may teach. Colleges with large occupational programs rely heavily on business, government and industry for part-time instructors in related fields. Quite a few part-time instructors recruited from non-educational fields are professionals in medicine, law, government, and accounting qualified to teach specialized and regular academic or transfer courses.

Surveys of the sources of part-time faculty go back a long time. Kennedy found that in 1964, 54 percent of the part-time faculty teaching in 19 of the 26 Illinois colleges had been recruited from secondary schools. At the same time 11 of the 12 Maryland colleges recruited only 26 percent from that source since they were able to tap the large group of full-time government employees to the extent of 34 percent (Kennedy, 1967). Kennedy observed that Maryland educators probably relied on government workers because of their availability, high educational qualifications and the prestige (or image) such employees gave the colleges.

Retired faculty have not been a significant source of part-time instructors (Bender and Breuder, 1973). In a few colleges they are given the opportunity to continue teaching (Hutchinson Community Junior College, 1973), but most retirees are more likely to be occasional day-to-day substitutes, particularly where the amount of reimbursement they may receive is limited by law. Day instructors are a major source of evening part-time instructors, though they form a smaller proportion of the total, approximately 15-20 percent in Illinois and 24.7 percent (6,286 of 25,371) in California. However, 45.6 percent (6,286 out of 13,788) of the California day faculty teach in the evening.

For the immediate future part-time instructors will continue to be recruited from the above sources. The relative importance of each source will change, however, as a result of the increase in technical-vocational and adult education classes, adoption of *pro rata* pay schedules equal to the full-time salary schedules, and continued high unemployment rate among teachers. Business and industry and the K-12 schools will remain among the principal sources for part-time instructors for the career and adult education courses. For the academic courses college graduates with teaching majors may become a major source if the teacher unemployment rate remains high. A worsening of the unemployment situation may lead to greater restrictions on the number of units that a day instructor may be permitted to teach on an overload basis and/or to the adoption by more colleges of the policy giving first priority to such positions to unemployed teachers. The switch to *pro rata* pay may also affect the number of day instructors employed on overload assignments. With the removal of the cost incentive administrators may resort to the employment of recent college graduates on a major fraction of a teaching load or on a split day and evening program.

It is almost certain that full-time faculty will resist attempts to deprive them of their long-held priority position to part-time assignments but the pressure may be too strong for them to overcome. By demanding *pro rata* pay the faculty organizations are paving the way for their own displacement as evening part-time instructors. A few college policies and collective bargaining agreements already prohibit full-time faculty from overload assignments; more are placing tighter controls on the amount of such assignments. A concomitant of *pro rata* pay, status as a regular member of the faculty, will make it difficult to bump such a part-time regular faculty member in order to give a full-time regular faculty member an overload assignment. It will be even more difficult in colleges where the part-time regular faculty are members of faculty organizations and the employee bargaining unit.

Qualifications of Part-Time Instructors

In discussions of the growing practice of hiring large numbers of part-time instructors, questions concerning their qualifications invariably arise and comparisons are made with the qualifications of full-time instructors. As with many evaluative judgments of educational practices there is little objective evidence to support the differing judgments. Most are subjective, often rationalizations to support one's opinion or practice. It is as unlikely for administrators to state that part-time instructors are not as well qualified as full-time instructors as it is for tenured faculty and their representatives to state the opposite. The truth of the matter is that "there is no statistical evidence that full-time faculty are any better than part-time people" (Harper, 1975) or vice versa.

Yet there are many who insist that part-time instructors are more effective than full-time instructors. Administrators of evening and adult education divisions maintain that part-time instructors put forth more effort in preparation and teaching than full-time instructors because they must satisfy the needs of the students or else lose them and their jobs. The full-time instructors protected by tenure are not under the same pressure; they retain their positions even if their students drop out.

Countering these claims are the faculty who decry the proliferation of part-time instructors, maintaining that it is changing for the worse the nature of the community college and adversely affecting the quality of instruction (Weintraub, 1975). Some support for this opinion is provided by a study of 209 part-time instructors at four Midwestern institutions in which Seitz (1971) concluded that part-time faculty were less knowledgeable about the educational environment, less positively committed to junior college education, and held less favorable attitudes toward the institution.

It is ironical that many who are most prone to extoll the virtues of the part timers and to make invidious comparisons with the full-time instructors at the same time deplore the absence or inadequacy of induction programs—including pre-service, orientation and in-service. Nearly all investigators agree that "new part-time instructors receive a minimum of orientation upon appointment" (Kennedy, 1967). Bender and Breuder concluded that "very little is done to assist part-time faculty to improve their instruction or to have a better understanding of the people they serve" (1973).

For the occupational and the adult programs the qualifications for part-time instructors are often different, neither better nor worse, than those of the full-time instructors even when the programs are the same. In these programs special skills or abilities may be needed. There is less concern about a part-time instructor's ability to teach any other subject or skill than the one for which he is employed. The administrator has more freedom in replacing a part-time instructors if his particular subject or skill is not needed. Not so, of course, for the full-time instructor. When he is employed the administrator must be assured that he is well versed to teach various subjects in a discipline or program in case he must be reassigned. In general the qualifications for initial employment of full-time and part-time instructors in the academic or baccalaureate subjects or disciplines are more likely to be similar than the qualifications for occupational, remedial or adult education subjects.

Part-Time Wage Rates

Until recently, salary data for part-time faculty were not as readily available as for full-time instructors. However, the situation is changing as a result of the large growth in part-time faculty and the concern of full-time instructors who are fearful that the lower-paid faculty may undermine salaries. Consequently they are paying greater attention to part-time pay, particularly to the ratio of part-time pay to the *pro rata* portion of full-time pay.

The industrial pattern of higher rates for overtime has not been adopted by or forced upon educational institutions. This may be an acknowledgment that overtime is not an onerous activity, even that it is an easy method of increasing one's pay. Perhaps it results from a fear that overtime pay may lead to the hiring of outsiders or to elimination of overtime work by hiring full-time instructors. Not only would full-time day instructors thereby lose the opportunity for extra pay, they would lose the advantage of using these assignments as a buffer when reduction in force becomes necessary since such assignments are commonly used to complete a full-time instructor's program that is below the normal for a full load. Whatever the reasons, higher rates for overtime teaching seems not to be a considered issue. In contrast, the nonprofessionals—maintenance personnel, secretaries, technical personnel—are often paid higher overtime or differential rates for work beyond the normal day or assignments in the evening hours. This is particularly true of those nonprofessional employees who are union members and/or are working in classifications covered by regulations or laws requiring the payment of the prevailing wage rates of similar employees in private enterprises.

The logic supporting the lower pay for part-time work whether performed by regular or part-time instructors was and continues to be that the extra class assignment is less arduous or requires less responsibility from the instructor than does the full-time assignment of the regular instructor. The latter's classroom duties are supposed to represent only one-half to one-third of his full responsibilities. His other duties may include student advising at registration time and during the year, serving on committees dealing with curriculum, selection of texts, library books and other materials, departmental and college governance, and related activities. The part-time instructor is not usually required to maintain office hours or participate in other than his classroom activities. Moreover, since the part-time instructor often teaches a course that duplicates one he is teaching in the day at the same or another college, he presumably has to spend little or no extra time in class preparation or in making new quizzes or examinations.

Apart from the logic there is evidence that administrators are resorting to part-time instructors because their hour or semester rate of pay is only a fraction of the yearly rate of full-time instructors and their fringe benefits are either nonexistent or fewer in number. A three-hour class taught by a part-time instructor on an hourly basis typically costs from one-half to four-fifths the cost of a similar day class taught by a full-time instructor on a yearly salary (Lombardi, 1973).

Pay for part-time instructors tends to be higher in metropolitan colleges than in suburban and rural colleges. Pay scales have increased markedly since the 1950's and since 1970 have included some fringe benefits. Of the three major methods of payment the hour rates are slightly lower than the semester rates and both are significantly lower than *pro rata* scales. Few colleges use proration to determine part-time pay; where it is, the beneficiaries are likely to be full-time instructors teaching an overload class and part-time instructors teaching more than a specified fraction of a full-time load, usually during the day. Non-teaching personnel, counselors, librarians, and media coordinators are often paid less than classroom instructors.

The actual rates paid to the regular faculty teaching overload classes tend to be, and will continue to be, higher than those paid to other part-time instructors. In some colleges the rates are set higher while in colleges that have adopted preparation-type schedules more full-time faculty than part-time faculty qualify for the higher rates by virtue of their greater experience and advanced degrees.

By 1985 or earlier, salaries for day part-time instructors will be proportionate to those for full-time instructors. This prediction is based on the significant progress so far made in this direction and the probability of general legislation or court action mandating equal pay for equal work. It is also reasonable to predict that for evening division instructors the hour or semester pay scales will continue to rise in line with or at a higher rate than full-time salaries. The prospect for *pro rata* pay for them is slim although it cannot be ruled out completely; an equal pay for equal work ruling could very well be broad enough to include them.

Summary and Conclusion

The number of part-time instructors has increased dramatically during the last five years. Whereas full-time instructors formerly outnumbered part-time instructors, in many colleges today they represent only about one-third of all instructors. Additionally, colleges are resorting to part-time instructors for day classes, a practice that was uncommon before the middle 1960's.

Part-time instructors for evening classes are recruited from K-12 schools, other colleges, business, industry, government, and recent college graduates. Day part-time instructors come primarily from recent college graduates, women, and a few from business, industry and government. Full-time instructors are an important source of part-time evening instructors.

Qualifications of part-time instructors—especially day part timers—are only slightly different from those of full-time instructors in comparable teaching areas. On average, fewer part-time instructors than their full-time counterparts have advanced degrees; they also have fewer years of teaching experience. Aside from these data, the contention that part-time instructors are or are not as competent as full-time instructors is debatable, primarily because the criteria for competence vary and because few administrators or faculty members are willing to utilize sophisticated evaluation procedures.

Induction of part-time instructors into service involves little in-service training. Most receive hardly more than an hour or two of advice from a department chairman or dean. Efforts to institute formal in-service programs have been made but because of costs involved, lack of response from part-time instructors, and difficulties in arranging for sessions, they have not been very productive. It must be pointed out that in-service training programs for full-time faculty are not noted for their prevalence or effectiveness.

Working conditions for evening part-time instructors have improved markedly in such amenities as office space, lounging areas, and secretarial and food services. On the campuses of most colleges, supplies, equipment, and support from the library, media center, and other learning adjuncts are readily available. At least one administrative office staffed by a senior administrator remains open for part of every evening and during the early weeks of the semester and departmental or other day faculty members are assigned to assist new part-time instructors.

At off-campus centers working conditions are far from ideal. Supervision is inadequate or nonexistent except for an occasional visit by an administrator or chairman from the main campus, and hardly any educational or personal support services exist either for the faculty or students. The management and the educational aspects of these rapidly expanding centers may develop into a scandal unless administrators direct more attention to them. It is anomalous for state and accreditation agencies to place such high value on supervision, the library, and educational resources on campus and disregard the effects on the educational program of their almost total absence on the off-campus sites.

The typical workload of a part-time instructor is between three and six hours per week. A few may work as much as 90 percent of a full-load. Limitations and restrictions on the number of hours a part-time instructor may be employed are common; a few colleges even prohibit full-time staff from accepting a part-time assignment. Much more frequently full-time instructors have first priority to at least one part-time assignment.

The coming years will witness faculty organizations' sponsoring greater membership drives to recruit part-time instructors. Part-time instructors are ambivalent about their course of action. Considerable sentiment is developing for a separate organization but no trend is observable. In New York City the part-time instructors have formed a separate organization and still maintain membership or association with the organization of full-time instructors. Where day part-time instructors teach a percentage or number of hours specified in state law, college policy, or collective bargaining agreement they join the faculty organization. In an agency shop they have no choice since for all practical purposes they become members of the employee bargaining unit.

The objective of faculty association efforts is to achieve by legislation or bargaining "equivalent pay for equivalent work for all community college instructors." Additionally, they are pressing for other perquisites and responsibilities such as "due process, with the explicit requirement that they are hired and evaluated by the standards and procedures used for the full-time faculty. The responsibilities of part-time faculty should be *pro rata* to those specified by the district for the full-time faculty and college committees, participating in curriculum development and meeting professional growth expectations" (FACCC Bulletin, 1975). Though progress is slow these objectives are being realized by increasing numbers of part-time instructors.

Indirectly, *pro rata* pay may reduce the number of part-time positions since the cost advantage of splitting a full-time position into two or more part-time positions will be negligible. Also, if all teaching assignments are paid on a *pro* *rata* basis, the full-time day instructors will lose opportunities for part-time overload. Evening part-time positions will be used to complete the teaching schedule of day instructors without a full load. A third possibility is that boards of trustees will eliminate overload assignments in order to help relieve the high teacher unemployment rate. A few already restrict overload assignments, not necessarily for this reason.

Another probable side effect of the increased cost of *pro rata* pay will be a reduction in course offerings, which in turn will induce a decline in enrollment, both in absolute numbers and in full-time equivalents. Only colleges with a sound tax base and/or with adequate state subsidies will be able to continue maintaining their present enrollment while paying *pro rata* salaries. The present surge in enrollment, composed largely of part-time students, has been partly financed through savings made possible by hiring low-paid instructors, a fact not widely publicized.

As the movement toward equal pay for equal work gains momentum and acceptance administrators will have to look elsewhere to offset increased costs. In the past, state and federal aid could be counted on for added funds but during the past five years they have not been as generously available as during the 1960's. Tuition and/or fees up to a point will bring in more money but if these become excessive, they cause a reduction in enrollment and in state support which is based on enrollment. Of course, under certain conditions a decrease in enrollment may solve the financial problem, but few administrators would welcome a reduction in enrollment as a solution. The most obvious, and the most difficult, method of achieving savings is to change the method of teaching, a solution that has been suggested by Ruml and Morrison (1959), Coombs (1968), Machlup (1970), Cohen (1969), and others. The chances of this happening within the next decade are extremely unlikely. Whatever the solution to the problem of added costs, one of the results is likely to be a change in the imbalance of part-time to full-time faculty in on-campus classes as fewer part-time instructors are employed.

Pro rata pay or a salary schedule considerably higher than the present low scales of 50 to 75 percent of the full-time salary schedules is a reasonable expectation for part-time teachers during the next ten years. It will come by negotiation, by state or federal mandate, or though court action. Equal pay for equal work is a slogan ready made for moonlighters and part timers. It has already become national policy for women educators under the Equal Pay Act of July 1, 1972 (Lester, 1975); extending the policy to part-time instructors should follow in the near future, thereby abolishing one of education's oldest practices. Such an accomplishment will take its place among those other faculty gains of lower workload, collective bargaining, right to strike, and higher salaries.

References

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1974). *1974 community and junior college directory*. Washington, DC.

Bender, L. W., & Breuder, R. L. (1973). Part-time teachers—"step children" of the community college. *Community College Review*, *1*(1), 29–37.

Charles Stewart Mott Community College (Michigan). *Faculty master contract. An agreement between the Charles Stewart Mott Community College Board of Trustees and the Mott Community College Education Association. August 16, 1973 to August 15, 1975.*

Cohen, A. M. (1969). *Dateline '79: Heretical concepts for the community college*. Beverly Hills, CA: Glencoe.

Coombs, P. H. (1968). *The world educational crisis: A systems analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

FACCC Bulletin. (April, 1975). Sacramento, California: Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges.

Guichard, G., Mangham, C., & Gallery, G. M. (April, 1975). *Part-time employment, item 8*. Report to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, Sacramento, CA.

Harper, W. A. (1975). Advice from the founding fathers. *Community and Junior College Journal*, *45*(9), 8–10.

Heinberg, S. (1966). *Procedures for the supervision and evaluation of new part-time evening-division instructors in California junior colleges*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Henry Ford Community College (Michigan). *Agreement between the Board of Trustees of Henry Ford Community College and the Henry Ford Community College Federation of Teachers, local 1650. 1973–1975*. Dearborn, MI.

Hutchinson Community Junior College (Kansas). (1973). *Agreement between Hutchinson Community Junior College Board of Trustees and the Hutchinson Junior Community College Faculty Association*.

Illinois Junior College Board. (1971). *Report of selected data and characteristics, Illinois public junior colleges 1970–71*. Springfield, IL.

Kennedy, G. (1967). Preparation, orientation, utilization and acceptance of part-time instructors. *Junior College Journal*, *37*(7), 14–15.

Lester, R. A. (1975). The equal pay boondoggle. *Change*, *7*(7), 38–43.

Lombardi, J. (1973). *Managing finances in community colleges*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Lombardi, J. (1974). *Reduction in force: An analysis of the policies and their implementation*. Topical paper no. 48. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges. ED 099 043.

Lombardi, J. (1975). *Riding the wave of new enrollments*. Topical paper no. 50. Los Angeles, CA: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

Machlup, F. (1970). *Education and economic growth*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Macomb County Community College (Michigan). (1972). *Agreement between Board of Trustees of the Community College District of the County of Macomb and Macomb County Community College Faculty Organization.*

Madison Area Technical College (Wisconsin). *Agreement between the Area Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, District no. 4 Madison, Wisconsin and the Madison Area Technical College Teachers' Union local 243. AFT, WFT, AFL-CIO: January 1, 1973–June 30, 1974. Revised February 7, 1973.*

Maryland State Department of Education. (May, 1969). Maryland standards for two-year colleges. *Maryland School Bulletin, 44*(2).

Minnesota Junior College. (April, 1973). *Professional staff contract between Minnesota State Junior College Board and Minnesota Junior College Faculty Association.*

Oakland Community College (Michigan). *Faculty master agreement. September 1, 1973–August 31, 1975.*

Phair, T. S. (1974). *Staffing patterns in California community colleges: A 1974–75 overview*. Sacramento, CA: California Community and Junior College Association. ED 100 445.

Ruml, B. R., & Morrison, D. H. (1959). *Memo to a college trustee*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schenectady Community College (New York). *Agreement between the County of Schenectady and the Schenectady Community College Faculty Association. Covering period from September 1, 1972–August 31, 1975.*

Scully, M. G. (1975). Part-time teachers: Many are angry. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 9*(16), 1.

Seattle Community College (Washington). *Contract and Agreement: Seattle Community College Board of Trustees and Seattle Community College Federation of Teachers local 1798. September 1, 1972–June 11, 1973.*

Seitz, J. E. (1971). *Professional orientations and attitudes of part-time junior college faculty*. Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University.

Washtenaw Community College (Michigan). *Agreement. Washtenaw Community College Board of Trustees and Washtenaw Community College Education Association. 1973–1975.*

Waubonsee Community College (Illinois). *Two-year agreement between the Board of Waubonsee Community College (community college district* *no. 516) and Waubonsee Community College Faculty Federation, local 2065, 1973–1975.*

Weintraub, H. (April/May 1975). Part-time teachers stir heat at Governor's advisory group. *AFT Community College Perspective.*

Williams, F. N. (1972). The neglected teachers: The part-time faculty. *Adult Leadership, 21*(3), 83–84.

Chapter 5

ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN IN IMPROVING INSTRUCTION

What does improving instruction mean? Does it mean increasing the knowledge or skills of the student? Increasing the power of the instructor to impart the knowledge or skill he possesses? Changing the technology of instruction? Should we replace desks with carrels in the classroom? Create units of instruction that require less attention from the instructor? Shall the instructor become a manager or foreman of a large resource center with machines, computers, and programmed materials that students can work on at their own speed and at their own convenience? Shall we make it possible for a student to do his learning at home where he can watch an ITV program or use a cassette; at a factory, office, or field; or on a tour of some kind? Are we interested in some standard of proficiency in the skill or knowledge the student acquired as measured by the difference between what he knew when he entered a class and what he knows when he leaves the class? In other words, "does whatever learning takes place depend primarily on the ability or aptitude of the student or on the quality of instruction (Hodgkinson, 1972)?"

Most of us like to believe that we are responsible for the difference in skill or knowledge that has taken place—provided the difference is positive. Few of us are willing to assume responsibility for a negative or zero difference. Failures, we insist, are not ours, but the student's. However, the emphasis on accountability is in essence an attempt to make the instructor responsible for the failures as well as the successes of the students. It also explains in part the unusual concern with improving instruction.

Lombardi, John. "Role of the Department Chairman in Improving Community College Instruction," *Role of the Department/Division Chairman in the Community College*, Report from the Community Junior College Program, Sam Houston State University, Junior College Graduate Program, ed. John R. Grable, April 1973, 7–12.

There is another aspect to the concern for improving instruction that has special pertinence to the community college; it relates to the open door or open access policy. Because the community college is non-selective in admission, we have to revise our concepts of the college student, especially as more of them enter our educational institutions. We now have students more representative of the general population in aptitude than was formerly the case. Although never as selective as the four-year colleges and universities, junior colleges before the 1950s were more selective than they are today. The "selectiveness" may or may not have been a college policy—but it resulted in a less heterogeneous population in aptitude as in other respects. This wide range of student aptitudes makes our efforts at improving instruction more challenging and more frustrating.

Still another facet of this topic is the difference between the teaching of knowledge or concepts, and the teaching of skills. The teaching of knowledge or concepts (as in English literature, history, philosophy) is less precise and more diffuse than the teaching of skills (as in typing, shorthand, bicycle riding, tennis, playing the piano, or performing a science experiment in a laboratory). Motivation of students may be the same for both types of teaching, but sustaining it requires much more effort in the teaching of concepts than in the teaching of skills. An important reason for this difference may be the immediacy of reward for the student learning a skill and satisfaction for the instructor observing the progress of the student. Measurement of progress in the knowledge and concepts subjects is difficult—and sometimes almost futile; in the skills it is not only possible to measure the degree of success but the rate of forgetting is far lower than in the others. Furthermore, once learned, the skills persist almost throughout life.

Another major difference between these two broad areas is that students are unlikely to challenge an instructor in a skill subject because in most cases he is recognized as an expert. But in history or a philosophy course, ignorance does not prevent students from disagreeing or even challenging the instructor. In fact, instructors encourage this independence; they deplore uncritical acceptance of concepts, ideas, theories. Instruction may be lively, invigorating, intensely emotional, but at the end of a discussion one would often be hard pressed to figure out what learning has taken place. As a consequence, it is extremely difficult to measure the improvement of instruction or to know if any improvement in student learning we can measure is related to the teaching. The difference between the teaching of skills and the teaching of knowledge or concepts is sometimes overlooked when people rate instructors in the skills subjects as superior to those in the knowledge or concepts subjects.

Another characteristic of the schools and colleges affecting the attempts to improve instruction is that an administrator has no more intelligence or knowledge than an instructor. Some instructors go beyond this, claiming that acceptance of an administrative post is a sign of inferior intelligence! At best, an administrator, and especially a chairman, is considered only as the first among equals—chosen or elected to prevent anarchy and to help the group maintain parity with other departments. Good instruction is only one of the ways parity may be maintained.

From the administrator's point of view the chairman is immediately responsible for the health of the department, the welfare of the instructors and supporting personnel, and the progress of the students—all of which ultimately means responsibility for the instructional program.

In this dichotomous in-between position—part faculty, part administrator—the chairman must assure the faculty of his loyalty to the department above anything else and maintain reasonably cordial relations with the administration, always careful not to be tabbed as the tool of the administration. If he is able to reconcile these seemingly contradictory roles he can create an effective environment for the difficult task of improving instruction.

Once having established himself as capable of maintaining this fine line between concern for the welfare of the faculty and loyalty to the institution, the chairman is ready for tackling the task of improving instruction. Here he has the initiative or may assume it. Obviously, there is no ready-made kit on improving instruction. Each chairman must work within the environment of his department. If he is among the lucky chairmen of departments in which skills are the major objectives, he can proceed with much more assurance of acceptability of plans than if he is among those in departments in which knowledge and concepts are the predominant objectives.

Observing the physical surroundings of learning is probably a good place to start the process of improvement. Any success the chairman may have in replacing worn out or obsolescent equipment; securing new equipment, supplies, and assistance; refurnishing the rooms, laboratories, and offices will make for greater receptivity and cooperation from instructors in improving instruction. Visits with the instructors in their offices, classrooms, and laboratories are effective in establishing the feeling that the chairman is interested in their welfare and that of the department. At the same time, he gets an overview of the department.

Next (I use the seriatim device only for convenience; some of the activities are occurring simultaneously) the chairman should examine the state of learning by as many objective instruments or methods or data as are available. If the college has a research director he may have information on the inputs and outputs of the educational process. The chairman will need all the data available to make an adequate assessment of what is happening to the students as they pass through the classes in his department. From this examination of data about students' aptitudes and learning progress and the observations of the physical surroundings, he will discover areas of excellence, moderate acceptability, mediocrity, stagnation, and even deterioration. Some or all of these conditions may be present, especially in a large department.

Enumerating inputs, aptitude of students, and outputs, products, and benefits is relatively easy. We can measure (test) a student when he enters a class and when he leaves. Assuming we have developed standards we can measure the difference on the two tests. This is commonly done in the elementary and secondary schools through standardized tests. It is often done in skill subjects such as typing, shorthand, composition and reading, and mathematics. It is done less effectively in the academic subjects. We can also measure the instructor's power of student retention—an output that can be extended to the department in the form of certificates and degrees awarded, transfers to senior institutions, degree of success on local, state, or national examinations such as for registered nursing, certified public accounting, or civic service positions.

We can get student reactions, directly and indirectly. Retention is one form, although an indirect one. Another is to observe the enrollment trends in the same subjects by different instructors. A more common method is to encourage students to evaluate their experience, usually through a questionnaire.

With these data, the chairman can begin involving the instructors. Strategy and timing are important for the success of any program in this delicate area. Involvement of instructors (as early as possible) is a must. Instructors are already accustomed to sharing responsibility in the development of policy and assuming the chores and tasks such as preparing syllabuses, selecting texts, library books, equipment and other teaching materials, supervising nonprofessional staff, preparing the budget, making the schedule, revising catalog copy, recruiting new instructors, and evaluating probationary instructors. Involvement in these activities is important since it contributes directly and indirectly to the improvement of instruction. Involvement gives the instructors a part in the inputs and a stake in the outcomes. Unfortunately, the chairman will rarely get as much cooperation as he may wish, for most instructors are too busy with their classroom assignments to spend much time on departmental activities. They will spend a little—which is all that the chairman should expect.

Timing is really part of the strategy. In the course of an academic year occasions occur when a discussion of this subject is natural and expected. These occasions may occur at any time of the year. They may involve the department or an individual instructor. Sometimes, their chairman may create the occasion. Here are a few that have proved effective:

(1) at the beginning of a school year, especially if the president points out weaknesses that need attention;
(2) when a self-study is being prepared for an accreditation visit;
(3) when a plan for the implementation of a law or regulation requires periodic evaluation of instructors and/or instruction;
(4) when an instructor or group of instructors asks for action because "students are not as good as they used to be";
(5) when new technologies or new theories are being discussed;
(6) when textbooks are being reviewed for possible adoption and audio-visual equipment, library books, and supplies are being ordered;
(7) immediately following a crisis such as occurred after Sputnik;
(8) when it becomes obvious that an instructor has become lax in his classroom assignments, is having difficulty with his students, and has an unusually high dropout rate.

If formal evaluation is required by college policy, the chairman can make this process an effective means of improving instruction. Depending upon the ingredients, the chairman can utilize each step from the class visitation, post-visit conference, to the written evaluation as an opportunity for the improvement of instruction. This requires more than the single sentence or check marks that characterize so many evaluation reports. Here the chairman must be specific in the reports, commending the instructor for his strengths and suggesting alternatives for overcoming weaknesses. By and large, few colleges have been able to make faculty evaluation an effective medium for improving instruction, probably because evaluation is associated with retention or separation of instructors. Disassociating the two functions—(1) improving instruction and (2) retention or separation of faculty—may be a necessary condition for effectiveness of evaluation. Considering how few instructors are separated from a staff, it is unfortunate that the latter function of evaluation overshadows the more important one of improving instruction.

A positive and effective method of improving instruction is through the use of incentives and rewards. We are accustomed to the use of these as a means of improving the learning of students but we are apt to be neglectful or wary of applying them to instructors. Yet, instructors, like students (and chairmen), need incentives and rewards, for indifference to or unawareness of what the instructors are doing may lead to less than top performance. Instructors need encouragement, notice, or stroking.

Merit pay, advancement to tenure status, promotion in academic rank, distinguished teacher awards, grants and sabbaticals for experimentation, research, and study are all important incentives and rewards for the improvement of instruction. Many of these originate outside the department, but the chairman often plays a key role in the selection or recommendation of instructors for these rewards, which usually have a monetary value.

There are many more opportunities for recognition of good performance that may originate with the chairman, which, although they have no monetary value, are very effective in promoting good teaching. In colleges with preparation and years of service salary schedules, these are even more important. All of them have one thing in common—personal recognition of the instructor by the chairman.

In this area, the chairman has an infinite number of occasions to recognize and encourage the members of the department, individually and collectively. I have mentioned the formal evaluation process as a major opportunity. Others occur when an instructor receives a new degree, gets an award or recognition for some service, or obtains a grant for research. Particularly worthy of commendation is the instructor's success with students, in the rate of retention, excellence of work exhibited or displayed, or outstanding performance in a contest or competition. Flattering to an instructor is the chairman's attendance at one of his public lectures. A demonstration of some departmental activity at a faculty or other meeting contributes to pride in the department which is an excellent aid to good instruction.

In this aspect of his role, the chairman should not overlook the personal, non-professional occasions when congratulations, condolences, sympathy, advice, and listening are called for. While not directly related to instruction this personal equation has an influence in the attitude of instructors toward their work, department, and the institution.

In this discussion, there has been no mention of the value of preparing, reviewing, and/or revising a statement of objectives for the department and similar statements for each course, for these seem almost axiomatic. The departmental statement forces the group to reexamine its role in the institution and to make changes caused by developments affecting the discipline. For example, the statements on foreign languages, physics, and engineering prepared just after Sputnik may not be appropriate today without considerable revision. Similarly, history, English, and sociology have been affected by the student ethnic movements of the late 1960s.

The chairman should solicit statements on individual courses as well. One need not accept the glamorous claims of behavioral objectives advocates to realize that the department should have well-defined statements of the objectives of the courses, together with the degree of proficiency expected and the means for measuring the amount of learning that has taken place. How detailed these should be depends on the nature of the subject, the method of instruction, the instructor, and the students. Copies of these should be given to the students at the appropriate times.

There is no one method of good teaching. Boulding maintains that we "know that emulation sometimes produces greater productivity and sometimes less," but we "don't know very much about when it does one and when it does the other" (Boulding, 1972). Probably the emphasis on a mix of learning and teaching procedures and techniques is related to this unknown. As a consequence, a variety of instructional approaches should be encouraged for the individual instructor and for the department.

The questions posed at the beginning of this article are causing considerable ferment in the area of instruction. Much of this ferment is related to the quality of teaching and learning; some of it is related to finding ways of increasing faculty productivity in order to help resolve the serious financial crisis of the colleges. Whether this interest in new technologies of teaching and learning is another fad that will disappear as so many others have is still a moot question.

For the next few years department chairmen will be pressed to consider these alternatives to the traditional method of classroom instruction posed in the questions. The likelihood of indiscriminate adoption of one or another of these "miracle drugs" is very great unless each of us exercises leadership in this search for better teaching and learning at a more reasonable cost. We are being asked to prove that our present methods are the best possible to produce quality teaching and effective learning. Many, including educators, doubt that they are. Because of this challenge, the improvement of instruction, next to finances, is our most serious issue. And the chairman has the responsibility to exercise leadership in meeting this challenge. Is it true that what "we really know about learning could . . . be put on a page?" Is it true that for student learning "it makes no difference what method of instruction is used or how experienced or inexperienced the instructor is (Cohen and Brawer, 1972)?"

In the face of these discouraging questions, how would I act if I were chairman of a department? I would accept the challenges and do everything in my power to disprove the assertions of our inadequacy, not by argument but by demonstration—by the only criterion that counts, the learning of students. My ignorance of how learning takes place would not prevent me from working for the improvement of instruction. I accept the premise of our paucity of knowledge, but I also know that learning does take place. So I would recommend a variety of teaching and learning methods for the benefit of the instructors and the students to improve the quality and increase the quantity of learning. Never have there been so many aids for improving teaching and learning as are available today. While waiting for the psychologists and neurologists to decode the complicated process of learning, I would be no less assiduous in my efforts to improve learning and teaching than a doctor is in his efforts to cure a patient suffering from cancer.

In conclusion, the chairman can be a most effective change agent in making the adjustment required in "teaching and learning" the new students; however, without a wholehearted commitment to full opportunity, the open door community colleges will become pallid imitations of idealized elitist colleges.

References

Boulding, K. E. (Winter 1972). "The Schooling Industry as a Pathological Section of the American Economy," *Review of Educational Research*, p.137.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1972). *Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, p. 208.

Hodgkinson, H. L. (March, 1972). "Encouraging Change and Significance in Higher Education" in *Legislative Decision Making in Higher Education: How to Get the Facts*, Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, p.41.

Chapter 6

A NEW LOOK AT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

A Question of Status

Throughout the years since comprehensive community colleges emerged from the original, largely transfer-oriented junior colleges, an unusually large effort has gone into transforming vocational-technical education courses and programs into academic courses and programs. So far the effort has been as fruitless as the alchemists' attempts to make gold and silver out of common metals. But the fervor of those who seek this magic change shows no signs of diminution. And as in the past, the modern alchemists conjure a new name, "career education," hoping its magical powers will cause a fusion or a transmutation. Thus they proclaim that vocational-technical has become academic education. The distinction should never have existed since all education is vocational in nature.

In 1972, while Sidney P. Marland was the United States commissioner of education, he reasoned that every young person, at whatever level he or she leaves formal education, should leave it with a specific and conscious career goal and the skills with which to reach that goal. He saw no conflict between occupational development and intellectual development because career education was a closely woven fabric of academic and occupational goals. But somehow Marland's exposition of the new goal did not meet friendly reception. The term "career education" has no more potency than the old names—occupational, semiprofessional, technical, vocational, trade.

Lombardi, John. "A New Look at Vocational Education," *Change* (Community College supplement), Vol. 5, No. 2, March 1973, 32a–32g.

While educators dabble in names, most community and business leaders, legislators and trustees do not mince words when they insist that vocational-technical education must be fostered more strenuously than it has been so far. They are no less adept at spinning rationalizations than the more practiced educators. They decry the emphasis on Hegel or on poetry. How can one earn a living with such subjects? How can the welfare rolls be reduced if students do not learn a skill? Has it not been shown that we have had little unrest and disturbance from students who were studying for their careers in occupational skills in vocational schools? Moreover, were not community colleges established primarily to prepare their students for jobs that are begging for trained artisans?

For advocates of vocational-technical education, the Protestant work ethic is still a strong, vital force. Not only do vocational-technical programs provide jobs for students and workers for manufacturing and business concerns, but they contribute to the welfare of the community and to the increase in the gross national product. Here again, our belief that through the schools everything is possible is revealed. Morality, human contentment, virtue and, especially pertinent here, economic satisfaction all are within reach if only everyone attends school.

These advocates of strong vocational-technical programs do not stop with words. They are ready to foster these programs by the most powerful incentive they have—money. They fund the programs much more generously than the more popular transfer programs. State after state with the aid of federal funds (and some of their own) either give an added amount per student enrolled in vocational-technical programs or fund these programs at a higher rate than the academic. For example, Michigan's annual allowance is half again as much for each vocational-technical student as for a student enrolled in an academic program; Colorado's is twice as much. Oklahoma allows colleges one full-time instructor for twelve technical students as contrasted to one for twenty-eight academic students.

Much of this generosity stems from Congressional appropriations. For the community colleges, aid for vocational-technical education has had a longer continuous history and accounts for the largest single appropriation of any category of federal aid. In fact, Congress has hardly ever turned down a proposal for an increase in vocational education expenditures.

Educators have set high goals for increasing enrollments in vocational education. Some would like to see one third to one half or more of their students in these programs. This merely attests to the enthusiasm with which administrators are falling in line—partly from conviction and partly from the lure of extra dollars, which are otherwise in short supply.

But administrators' enthusiastic support for vocational-technical education is alloyed with doubts. They ask themselves: Are there really so many jobs awaiting our graduates as we are told? If so, are none of the unemployed qualified to take the jobs? Do business and industry really need so many two-year graduates or one-year certificate students as they claim? Can we anticipate their needs?

Many factors affecting employment patterns are unanticipated. Automation removes people from certain areas of work but it does not remove the necessity for people themselves in that industry. As an example, many department stores have gone "self-service." This looks good on the personnel chart where dozens of clerks have been replaced by a couple of cashiers. However, these stores have learned that it is now necessary to employ guards against shoplifting, a function formerly performed by the clerks themselves. A similar situation prevails in apartment and office buildings. Automatic elevators put the elevator operators out of work, but the building manager is forced to employ building guards to perform the essential service formerly done by the operator. For which trades or skills should we educate or train the students?

The educator cannot help but observe what goes on in the world or work around him as he visits supermarkets, department stores, banks, motels, hospitals, medical and dental offices, and as he rides on airplanes and buses. He may wonder how many of those who wait on him need training for their jobs that cannot be better provided by the employer than by a community college. Bus drivers, salespeople, cashiers, most data processors, checkers, desk clerks and tellers often are trained on the job. When the jobs are there, the people can learn to use the tools. Check out any one of our large industries, such as tire-making, paint manufacturing, auto assembling, oil refining. Most of these are automated and require of their workers only a few hours or a few days of training. Auto repairing and photography courses are popular courses in many community colleges, but lots of youngsters are experts at these before they enroll. Obviously, there are some jobs that require extensive formal education, especially where a licensing feature is part of the qualification for some skills. And some skills—typing, surveying, machine tooling, airplane maintenance, and piloting, for example—are more readily learned in school. But these jobs are not in the majority.

Would the four or five million unemployed be hired if they learned a skill? If this is the meaning of unemployment, then the problem could easily be solved. Yet unemployment is only minimally related to the pool of people who know how to work; the availability of the jobs is the overriding issue. In World War II, when tens of thousands of jobs suddenly became available in the aircraft and ship-building industries and when an equivalent number of people incorporated the belief that working on the war effort was a good way for them to spend their time, the training programs for these industries developed rapidly and people learned quickly to do the necessary tasks. But how? The essential component in career education is the installation of the work ethic itself, the attempt to get the person to want to work at all. Few community colleges address this problem directly. Where would they begin?

We seem determined to persuade or force students to enroll in vocational-technical courses and programs. But why? If these courses and programs have the virtues ascribed to them, if they have such general approval by our President, Vice President, Congressmen, state officials, business and industrial and civic leaders, why are not the students struggling to enroll? Liberal arts, transfer and academic courses and programs do not share this wide approval, yet no inducement for enrollment seems necessary.

The secret lies in the failure to eradicate the lower status that people place on the vocational-technical courses and programs based in large part on the lower status accorded by our society to the skilled and semiskilled jobs. A job's salary is not as much a determinant of its status as public attitude; many skilled jobs pay higher wages than the more favored professional and semiprofessional white-collar jobs. This is the crux of the problem for educators, and no amount of rationalization will change it. Students, of course, do enroll in the vocational-technical courses and programs; but as soon as they can, many opt for the academic program, either for themselves or later for their children.

Another question keeps nagging at the administrator as he receives information about the students enrolled. Among other characteristics he notes that a large percentage of students are employed from a few to forty or more hours a week. Evidently the students have jobs, some requiring skills of a high order, before they enroll and they continue to work after enrollment. Have these students come to college to learn another skill or upgrade their present skills? Obviously, the answer for some must be "yes." For these, the ladder concept—in which a person is aided to move from one level to anther within his own general field—applies. But for a large number the answer is "no." They want not to upgrade a skill so much as to obtain a bachelor's degree to become a professional rather than a skilled worker, a white-collar rather than a blue-collar. This may be snobbery, or it may be unrealistic expectation, but those who use these pejoratives rarely apply them to themselves. It is snobbish or unrealistic for the student from the ghetto or the slum to aspire to white-collar status, but not for the student from the suburb or exurb. For the latter it is considered normal to seek the kind of education that will enable him to become a member of the white-collar class because he has acquired by birth the qualities necessary for this status.

I am not suggesting that the community colleges give up vocational-technical education or stop trying to make it attractive to students. The community colleges can still offer these courses and programs on their own merit without regard to the status factor. Status is not peculiar to these programs; it is endemic in all aspects of education. There are status differentials among academic courses, among community colleges and among community colleges as contrasted with four-year colleges.

Just as most of us accept the fact that the universities from which we graduated have different rankings, so students who freely enroll in vocational-technical courses will accept the fact that they are considered lower in status than those in the academic sequences. No amount of magical mixing or name-changing will deceive them. The student who freely chooses one of these programs and who succeeds in getting a job will make a satisfactory adjustment to life and will be grateful to the college for making this possible. Much evidence exists that the vocational-technical students are more loyal to the community college than the academic students. Alumni groups centered around a vocational-technical area thrive while those centered around an academic transfer major hardly get organized for one meeting.

A suggestion that surfaces from time to time is that the comprehensive community college is not the best environment for the vocational-technical courses and programs. No matter how much community college educators try, it is claimed, in that environment vocational-technical courses and programs automatically are relegated to second-class status. A better environment is the postsecondary area vocational-technical school, the technical college, or one of the many proprietary trade schools. In this environment a student knows from the beginning that he will be enrolled in a vocational-technical program or courses. He does not have to choose between the high-status transfer and the low-status vocational-technical major. He is in an environment in which all of the students and the great majority of instructors, counselors, and administrators are vocationally-oriented and committed to vocational-technical education. The status issue so troublesome to vocational-technical programs in the community colleges does not arise.

Of course, educators may point to the failure of the high school experiment with such separate schools. Vestiges of that experiment are visible in the schools that still retain "Manual Arts," "Polytechnic" or "Commercial" in their names. But must the postsecondary institutions repeat that experience? Many are convinced that they need not and will not. There is evidence that they may be right. Today, public postsecondary educational systems with a major emphasis on vocational-technical programs seem to thrive in most states side by side with the community colleges. This becomes quite evident as one peruses the names of the two-year postsecondary institutions listed in the annual *Community and Junior College Directory*: around one in five public institutions carry names that designate them as occupationally oriented. Area vocational-technical, vocational, technical, technical institute, area technical, and agricultural are common labels found in more than one-half of the states. Sometimes these labels are associated with the term "college;" more frequently they stand alone.

For a time it seemed that community or junior colleges would preempt postsecondary education, but despite spectacular successes in New York, California, Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Texas, Kansas, and Hawaii, the vocational-technical schools continue to thrive. However, the strong hold "college" has on Americans may prevail in transforming the vocational-technical schools into colleges.

One may wonder why the agitation for academic respectability is so strong among those favoring vocational-technical education since in most of the states two-year postsecondary vocational-technical schools coexist with community colleges. In addition, a community college without a vocational-technical program is the exception. In fact, many vocational-technical programs in these colleges vie in numbers of programs and students enrolled as well as in quality with the best in the strictly vocational-technical schools. It would be difficult to tell from its name that La Guardia Community College in New York City is the only college with an across-the-board program of cooperative education.

The agitation for parity arises from the fear that without it, vocational-technical education will not flourish despite the strong support it receives and the strenuous efforts of educators to make it attractive to young people. Educators and those not in education sense that neither money nor name-changing nor public pronouncements on the dignity of all occupations can counter the upward mobility theme of the American dream that pervades American life.

The status issue surfaces over and over again as, for example, when the Los Angeles board of education proposed that the University of California relax its admission standards by granting high school graduates credit for career education courses on a one for one basis with academic courses. The immediate unfavorable reaction of the University was no surprise. What was surprising was the haste with which the *Los Angeles Times* published an editorial—"A Curious Proposal for Education"—only two days after the board of education announcement was made. The editorial praised as sensible the board's effort to expand the variety and availability of vocational training classes for students whose interests basically are nonacademic, but it called attention to a contradiction in the board's special plea for university recognition of career education, while admitting that these courses are for students who are uninterested or cannot substantially benefit from traditional academic subjects. The controversy engendered by the Los Angeles board proposal confirmed what most educators know—that vocational education under whatever name does not have and will not soon gain equal status with academic education.

Community college educators should acquiesce and accept, or better, ignore the existence of the lower status of vocational-technical education and concentrate their efforts on developing programs that will benefit students preparing for employment for a better life. No educator need apologize for performing this mission. The various plans to make the programs more acceptable to students and to lower the barriers between vocational-technical and academic instructors are worthy, but too much stress on status may aggravate the problem rather than resolve it. The status issue between vocational-technical and academic education reminds one of yesterday's concern with improving the image of the community college, an endeavor as fruitless as the other. To be effective, public relations must be realistic; it must not be so smooth as to deceive even those who conduct it to believe the propaganda. If educators are convinced that vocational-technical programs should be included in the curriculum, then their principal concern is to make them outstanding programs. The students will have to decide whether they want to choose from among them. The community college should not become an instrument for those who would like to direct cast-off students into the vocational-technical programs. The more they try, the more unsuccessful they will be and the more harm they will inflict on these programs. These efforts will be self-defeating because a sort of Gresham's Law operates. Experience shows that if a program becomes merely a place in which to shunt low-aptitude students, the higher-aptitude students will avoid it, no matter how worthwhile.

An ideal program is one that is graduated to serve a wide variety of students. Capable students or students with previous experience should have the option of starting at an advanced level while those with no experience or lesser aptitude would have the opportunity to start at the beginning and progress as far as their ability or interest warrant. In organizing the programs we should recognize that the aptitudes of a group of students are nearly always a continuum from the highest to the lowest; likewise, any activity has a similar range or continuum of difficulty. Since vocational-technical programs lend themselves to individual work, it should be relatively easy to help the student find his place in a program and to progress at his own pace so that at whatever time he decides to seek employment he will find that his training will be an asset.

Concentrating on these aspects of vocational-technical programs rather than on bringing about a fusion or achieving equality with the academic programs will ensure the success of these programs in the community colleges. History will not be repeated if we avoid the pitfalls that hampered the development of vocational-technical programs in the high schools.

References

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1971). *Developing junior colleges.* Washington, DC.

Arkansas Community Junior College Board. (1970). *A study of the need and recommendations for the development of a comprehensive community college in Pulaski County, Arkansas.* Little Rock: Commission on Coordination of Higher Educational Finance.

Barlow, M. L. (1962). Vocational education in the fabulous future. *American Vocational Journal,* 37.

Bruhn, A. E. (1968). *Evaluation processes used to assess the effectiveness of vocational-technical programs.* Seminal paper. Los Angeles: Graduate School of Education, University of California.

Brunner, K. A. (1965). *Guide to organized occupational curriculums in higher education: Graduates July 1, 1961–June 30, 1962 and enrollments Oct. 1, 1962. Institutional data.* Bureau of Educational Research Circular 771. Washington, DC: U. S. Office of Education.

Gold, B. K. (1972). *An analysis of associate degrees awarded at L.A.C.C. 1962–1972.* Research study #72-15. Los Angeles City College.

Harris, R. G. (1972). External agencies: Roadblocks to career education. In D. W. Vernilye (Ed.), *The expanded campus.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hawaii Community College. (1972). *Vocational-technical graduate follow-up studies 1968–1971.* Honolulu: Office of the Vice President, University of Hawaii Community Colleges.

Hobbs, D. S., & Hayes, L. K. (1969). *Report of a study to develop background data, planning standards, and criteria for establishment of the Tulsa Junior College.* Prepared for Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. Oklahoma City.

Illinois Junior College Board. (1971). *Report of selected data and characteristics of Illinois Public Junior Colleges 1970–71.* Springfield, IL.

Lombardi, J. (1964). Occupational education in California junior colleges. *The Educational Record, 45*(2).

Mensel, F., & Allen, M. P. (Eds.). (1970). *Postsecondary occupational education: Federal programs for the 1970's.* Proceedings of a seminar sponsored by the American Vocational Association and the American Association of Junior Colleges. Washington, DC: The American Association of Junior Colleges.

Michigan State. (1971). Public acts of 1971; Act no. 121, sec. 9(b). Approved by Governor September 19, 1971.

Ohio Board of Regents. (1971). *Ohio master plan for public policy in higher education 1971*. Columbus, OH.

Oregon Community College Association. (1972). *Policy maker's guide 1971–72—part I*. Salem, OR.

Portland Community College. (1972). *Status of spring 1971 graduates*. Portland, OR.

Pratt, A. L., & Frederick, M. (1970). *Your career and two-year colleges*. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Soper Associates. (1972). *Cooperative education at La Guardia Community College: An assessment and description of the initiation of an innovative curriculum*. Albany: Bureau of Occupational Education Research, New York State Education Department.

Chapter 7

FOUR PHASES OF DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION

Developmental education is a major segment of the community college educational program, including curriculum and student support services. Originally, developmental education focused on the academically disadvantaged students who for a "variety of social, economic, and ethnic-interracial factors" were unable to exercise "full freedom of choice" and participate in "upward mobility" (Morrison and Ferrante, [1973c]). Today, developmental education incorporates a broader segment of students who need help to "overcome any deficiencies they may have in their preparation for post-secondary education" (Cuyahoga Community College, 1975). This definition is broad enough to include the curriculum of every two-year public college, for there is none that does not offer some developmental education courses in English, reading, speech, mathematics or arithmetic, as well as special counseling, tutoring, and assistance in study laboratories.

Types of Programs

Although developmental and remedial are used interchangeably in both practice and the literature, developmental usually refers to a program of courses or to a group of students. Remedial most often refers to individual courses or students. In this paper developmental refers to four programs designed to help students overcome or compensate for:

Lombardi, John. "Four Phases of Developmental Education," ERIC *Junior College Resource Review*, March 1979.

1. Deficiencies in grades or subjects required for admission to a senior institution or to colleges and transfer programs (Pre-Transfer);
2. Deficiencies in reading, writing, speech, arithmetic, study habits, motivation and other personality traits (Remedial);
3. Deficiencies in literacy and in basic skill subjects necessary for a high school diploma (Adult Basic Education);
4. Physical or mental handicaps that impose limitations on the functioning of students academically or socially (Handicapped).

The trend is toward integrating the various developmental programs with the regular programs. The degree of integration depends upon the nature of the students' deficiencies, the required faculty qualifications, the learning system, funding sources and other factors. Considerable overlapping occurs between programs.

The *Pre-Transfer* Program is the most closely allied with the regular program. Students are high school graduates who tend to be in the same age group as the transfer students. The non-transfer courses—English composition, elementary and intermediate algebra, plane geometry, foreign languages, and sciences—are college credit courses, an integral part of the departmental offerings, taught by the regular faculty, and funded in the same manner as the regular transfer courses. This is the oldest developmental program, dating back to the origins of the junior college.

At the opposite extreme is the *Adult Basic Education* (ABE) Program of courses in reading, language, arithmetic, and English as a Second Language (ESL). These courses are of an elementary or high school level for illiterates or students who wish to qualify for a high school diploma through the General Educational Development (GED) tests.

A transplant from the adult high school, the ABE Program is a recent addition to the community college curriculum, and unlike the mixed reaction encountered by remedial programs, the ABE Program has aroused little unfavorable reaction, probably because as a separate, non-college program it does not impinge on the college program. ABE students average about 30 years of age and attend classes on a part-time basis, usually in the late afternoon or evenings (Johnson, 1976; Witter, 1978). Most of the instructors are part timers, many with special qualifications.

The *Remedial* Program, the most widely-known of the four, ranges from the elementary to the collegiate in curriculum content. Often it is organized as a separate entity with a special name such as Project Search (Cuyahoga Community College, 1975), People Center (Colston, 1976), Project II (Fishman and Dugan, [1976]), Upward Bound (Morrison and Ferrante, 1973a), PACE—Personalized Approach to College Education (Carter, 1976). The students are usually high school graduates or recent dropouts and are slightly older than the regular students. They have higher educational qualifications than the ABE students and lower scholastic aptitude than the Pre-Transfer.

Criteria for admission to remedial courses or programs vary widely from compulsory placement to voluntary placement with a number of persuasive strategies in between. In a study of 137 midwestern colleges Ferrin (1971) found that standardized test scores were most critical in selecting students for remedial courses or programs. The Community College of Philadelphia strongly advised students scoring below the 20th percentile in the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills reading section to enter Project II (Fishman and Dugan, [1976]) while Florida Junior College defined remedial students as persons who scored below the 10th grade reading level on the Nelson-Denny Reading Test (Cosby, 1974). For the People Center of Staten Island Community College low self-image and poor performance expectations were the requirements (Colston, 1976).

Remedial programs that have special funding tend to be segregated. These may be composed of one or two classes or a group of classes for a large number of students, sometimes exceeding 500 (Colston, 1976). Many states provide additional funding for operating expenses and for student aid. Practitioners and researchers differ about the relative merits of integrated and segregated programs, with little evidence to support the greater effectiveness of one over the other (Cuyahoga Community College, 1975).

For a variety of reasons, remedial education has become associated with education for minorities. Part of this perception results from the large emphasis in the literature on the ethnicity of students and from the numerous public and foundation grants for recruiting minority students and for learning projects involving minorities. Also contributing to the stereotype is that "minority students are more highly represented in [such programs] than in the student body as a whole" (Ferrin, 1971) and that a higher proportion of minority students are in programs (1 in 5) than in courses (1 in 9). Both figures, however, indicate that more white students than minority students are enrolled in remedial courses and programs.

The *Handicapped* Program includes three principal classifications of students: the blind or visually impaired, the deaf or hearing impaired, and the mobility impaired. Within this group are many shades of impairment from those who can function with very little assistance to those who have "no useable speech . . . no mobility . . . no writing capacity" (Katz and Flugman, 1977), and a wide range of scholastic aptitude from the highly gifted to the mentally retarded (Florida State Department of Education, 1977). The average age of handicapped students is over 26 years, with a range of 18-56. Men outnumber women (Spencer and Others, 1977).

Except for the more seriously handicapped students, the goal of the Handicapped Program is integration in all activities. Success in this goal depends upon the availability of "special services not offered to other students and/or intensified services . . . for . . . successful functioning" (Cuyahoga Community College, 1975), e.g., ramps, elevators, special parking, advanced registration, readers, writers, test proctors, mobility orientation, modified physical education activities (Cuyahoga Community College, 1975; Ingalls, 1978; Los Angeles City College, 1978).

Due to such special factors as militancy of the handicapped (Bennett, 1978), humanitarian appeal, awareness of college personnel to the special needs of the handicapped, and state and federal legislation, Handicapped programs are expanding at a higher rate than the other programs. The militancy of the handicapped has resulted in broader and more prescriptive legislation than the older rehabilitation acts. Section 504 of the federal 1973 Rehabilitation Act which states "no otherwise qualified handicapped individual shall . . . be excluded from participation in . . . any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (Peirce, 1978) is for the handicapped a Bill of Rights "to an education, to services, to equality on campuses, and to employment" (Katz and Flugman, 1977). In addition, Congress increased appropriations for 1979–80 by 57 percent from $623 million to $976 million (Neill, 1978).

The militancy of the handicapped and the interpretation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act has led to conflicts between the colleges and those handicapped students who wish to enroll in programs for which the colleges believe they are unqualified because of physical disabilities. A case involving such a dispute between a deaf practical nurse who wanted to enroll in a registered nursing program at Southeastern Community College (N.C.) reached the Supreme Court on appeal from a lower court ruling favoring the student. The case was considered important enough for 27 states and the American Council on Education to join Southeastern in the appeal, in order to get answers to such questions as: "Does Section 504 . . . require institutions to admit [handicapped] persons if their disabilities make it impossible for them to 'participate effectively in the educational program and the career to which it leads?'" ("Washington Notes . . .," 1978); and "Does Section 504 guarantee the handicapped's 'right to access to the same facilities other people use, regardless of cost?'" (Peirce, 1978). A report of a workshop on "Mainstreaming: Competence and Performance" obliquely touched on this issue (Katz and Flugman, 1977).

Enrollments

Because of the absence of distinct program parameters, enrollments in the four developmental programs is difficult to even estimate. Handicapped students, for example, may be enrolled in any of the developmental programs as well as the regular transfer, occupational or adult education programs. Sometimes a student may be enrolled or classified in two or more of the programs. Further confusing the issue is the fact that adult and adult basic education enrollments are combined in some states, while pre-transfer and remedial students are reported as college-credit enrollments (Lombardi, 1978).

Some figures do exist, however. In response to a 1977 questionnaire 25 colleges reported enrollments of 1,795 full-time and 255 part-time handicapped students, and 18 of 25 stated that enrollments of the disabled increased over the previous year. Other indications of enrollment (not exclusively community college) were the estimates of 675 to 700 blind students in over 100 campuses across the country and 9,000 handicapped students in training in New York colleges (Katz and Flugman, 1977).

As a result of the widespread interest in remedial education, data are more plentiful than in the other developmental programs. Research and official state reports reveal that the number and proportion of students is large. In general, it may be conjectured that the statistics are on the conservative side, since few colleges, except when seeking grants, overstate the number of students enrolled in remedial courses.

In a survey of 137 midwestern colleges in 11 states, Ferrin (1971) reported that approximately 40,000 students (12 percent of 333,000) were enrolled in some form of remedial education. Enrollments in the 16 college programs described in the report ranged from 100 to 1,500. Six of the colleges enrolled over 500 students. One college reported that over 40 percent of the students were enrolled in its Learning Skills Center; another that 15 percent were enrolled in the Remedial Program. Three years later, Morrison and Ferrante found all the colleges surveyed (American Council on Education sample) had "special courses . . . and/or . . . special services for the academically disadvantaged" (1973b) although only "60 percent indicated that . . . students [were] enrolled in developmental, preparatory or remedial programs" (1973b).

Florida colleges enrolled 31,700 students in compensatory (remedial) and 41,200 in adult elementary and secondary programs in 1975–76, about 14 percent of the total enrollment of more than half a million (Florida State Department of Education, 1977). In Fall 1976, Illinois colleges enrolled 36,000 or 12 percent of the total enrollment (326,000) in remedial/developmental and 38,000 or slightly more than 12 percent in general studies, which includes ABE and other student categories (Illinois Community College Board, 1976). ABE enrollment in Iowa colleges in 1975-76 amounted to 3,600 full-time equivalent students (FTEE) or 8 percent of the total FTE of 43,800 (Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, [1976]).

To summarize enrollment in the four developmental *programs* approximates 10 to 15 percent of the total college enrollment, a percentage that is likely to decrease if colleges tighten admission and academic standards and if they move away from segregated programs. Enrollment in developmental *courses* approaches the 30 percent mark, and for large inner-city colleges, the percentage may reach 50.

Program Impact

Developmental courses will increase as more colleges add courses in ABE and handicapped programs. The potential enrollment in the handicapped will be modest in contrast to that of the ABE enrollment, which, in ten years, has grown dramatically in Florida, Illinois, Iowa, and other states. Annually, about 400,000 (not all trained in the community colleges) take the GED tests, a tiny fraction of the estimated 62 million Americans who do not have a high school diploma (Witter, 1978). To tap this large group, colleges are establishing learning centers for preparation for the General Educational Development tests on campuses, in the traditional storefronts (Fishman and Dugan, [1976]), and in workplaces where management cooperates with the college (Witter, 1978).

Of the four developmental programs reviewed in this paper, the Pre-Transfer and the Handicapped are accepted as proper responsibilities of the community college by the public and college personnel; the former because it is closely related to the Transfer program and the latter because of sympathy, humanitarian impulses, compulsory aspects in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and generous financial support from state and federal governments.

The effectiveness of these programs varies with the expectations for the various disabilities. A good deal depends upon the experience in mainstreaming the handicapped in and out of the college (Katz and Flugman, 1977; Bennett, 1978). Strict interpretation of Section 504 may create situations in which very severely handicapped students will be given custodial, rather than educational services.

While ABE programs have aroused little internal opposition, remedial programs have elicited considerable opposition. Moore, for example, notes that "few teachers can, or want to, teach [the remedial student] at the college level, even fewer understand him, many reject him academically and socially" (Aarons, 1975). A newspaper reporter states, "Taxpayers and legislators are beginning to object to paying college prices for public institutions that provide large numbers of remedial students with what is essentially high school education" (Beck, 1978). This disaffection is serious enough to cause Gleazer to express strong disagreement with those who propose turning back "responsibility for inadequately prepared students . . . to the elementary and secondary schools" (Aarons, 1975).

Also indicative of the attitude toward remedial education is the movement for stricter admission standards, reintroduction of punitive grades, and enforcement of probation and disqualification policies. These measures apply to all students, but they bear most heavily on remedial students.

Inadequate knowledge on how to teach remedial students, and lack of understanding of their learning problems also feed this negative attitude. Since college instructors have little training for teaching remedial students (Moore, 1976), some colleges are trying to remedy this deficiency by inservice and staff development programs (Colston, 1976; Morrison and Ferrante, 1973b).

Numerous experiments have been conducted on the effectiveness of remedial education. Positive outcomes are reported for three-fourths of the midwestern college students by Ferrin (1971). A lower dropout rate, a higher grade point average, and a higher percent of completed courses differentiate students in the Pace Program at Community College of the Finger Lakes from a control group (Carter, 1976). On the negative side are Moore, Gordon and Wilkerson (in Ferrin, 1971), Jelfo (Cuyahoga Community College, 1975), and Losach (in Aarons, 1975). Roueche and Mink (1975) acknowledge that some programs maintain high retention rates but deplore the accelerated attrition among remedial students who enter the traditional programs.

The four phases of developmental education are in the tradition of the community college. Each has as its aim preparing the academically, economically, socially, or physically disadvantaged for entering the mainstream of American life through preparation for further education or through preparation for work. Though there is considerable disaffection with various parts of these programs, there is every indication that state and federal policy supports this role for the community college, a support made evident in legislation and in the financial inducements given to the colleges. It is worthy of note that the California legislature gave a high priority to Remedial and ABE Education when it distributed surplus funds to the colleges after Proposition 13. Other states, e.g., Florida, Illinois, New York, are also encouraging colleges to offer developmental programs.

Taken as a group, the four phases of developmental education constitute a large segment of the curriculum effort of the colleges. The likelihood is that they will grow to 50 percent within the next decade. Despite criticisms, they persist in keeping aloft "a lamp beside the golden door" for today's disadvantaged.

References

Aarons, H. (1975). *An evaluation of an individualized interpersonal and interdisciplinary team approach to remediation at Mohegan Community College.* Unpublished paper.

Beck, J. (January 19, 1978). More trouble ahead for colleges. *St. Petersburg Independent*, Part A, p. 15.

Bennett, L. (November 6, 1978). Handicapped seek entry to doctor ranks. *Los Angeles Times*, Part 1, p. 1.

Carter, L. G. (1976). *Developmental studies project, post-secondary disadvantaged. Final report.* Canandaigua, NY: Community College of the Finger Lakes.

Colston, J. A. (1976). *Minority programs in higher education: Alternatives to the revolving door.* Paper presented at the 56th Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, DC.

Cosby, J. P. (1974). *The developmental program—Is it working?* Unpublished paper.

Cuyahoga Community College (Ohio). (1975). *Conference proceedings: Annual Ohio developmental education conference (2nd Cleveland, October 6–7, 1974).* Cleveland, OH.

Ferrin, R. I. (1971). *Developmental programs in midwestern community colleges.* Evanston, IL: College Entrance Examination Board.

Fishman, F., & Dugan, M. (1976). *Alternative programs and services for the non-traditional student.* Unpublished paper.

Florida State Department of Education. (1977). *Report for Florida community colleges, 1975–76.* Tallahassee, FL.

Illinois Community College Board. (1976). *Student enrollment data and trends in the public community colleges of Illinois: Fall 1975, second term FY 1976, and fall 1976. Data and characteristics volume IV, number 1 [and] volume V, number 2.* Springfield, IL.

Ingalls, Z. (1978). Ideas on "integrating" the handicapped. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 17*(9), 15.

Iowa State Department of Public Instruction. (1976). *Opportunities in Iowa's area schools, 1976–77.* Des Moines, IA.

Johnson, B. (Ed.). (1976). *Adult Basic Education Instructional Materials Guide.* Ankeny, IA: Des Moines Area Community College.

Katz, D., & Flugman, B. (1977). *Community college support service and activity program for the disabled student.* New York: City University of New York, Institute for Research and Development in Occupational Education.

Lombardi, J. (1978). *Community education: Threat to college status? Topical paper number 68.* Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

Los Angeles City College (California). (1978). *Catalog, fall 1978.* Los Angeles.

Moore, W., Jr. (1976). *Community college response to the high-risk student: A critical reappraisal. "Horizons issues" monograph series.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges; and Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

Morrison, J. L., & Ferrante, R. (1973a). *Compensatory education in two-year colleges. Report no. 21.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Morrison, J. L., & Ferrante, R. (1973b). *The public two-year college and the culturally different.* Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Research and Development.

Morrison, J. L., and Ferrante, R. (1973c). *Why the disadvantaged drop out: The administrators' view.* Unpublished paper.

Neill, G. (1978). Washington report. *Phi Delta Kappan, 60*(4), 268–269.

Peirce, N. (December 3, 1978). Equal access for the handicapped — how a good idea became an absurdity. *Los Angeles Times*, Part 6, p. 5.

Roueche, J. E., & Mink, O. G. (1975). *Toward personhood development in the community college.* Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Seattle, WA.

Spencer, S. S., & Others. (1977). *Disabled students enrolled in California community colleges 1974–1975. Resource study.* Sacramento: California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor; and Fresno: California Association of Post-secondary Educators of the Disabled.

Washington notes: Supreme court asked to hear handicapped suit. (1978). *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 17*(12), 10.

Witter, E. (1978). G.E.D. teachers are a new breed. *Phi Delta Kappan, 60*(2), 110–111.

97/98

Chapter 8

THE DECLINE OF TRANSFER EDUCATION

Introduction

One of the most significant changes in the community college is the decline of transfer education, studies designed to lead toward the baccalaureate degree. The decline is most pronounced in enrollment but there is considerable evidence that transfer education is also losing its preeminence as the principal function of the college. This development is the more remarkable since the community college was originally organized as an institution that some educators hoped would enable universities to give up their lower divisions. This, of course, did not happen except in a few instances. More common were junior colleges which became four-year colleges—another indication of their transfer education orientation. Today, there is little activity in either direction, although occasionally a community college (Staten Island, for example) is converted to four-year status and upper division colleges in Florida and Illinois have been organized.

Reaction against the transfer emphasis appeared shortly after public community colleges began to multiply during the second and third decades of the century. The reaction reached crescendo proportions after World War II as enrollments skyrocketed and as it became evident that large numbers of the new students required or wanted programs (vocational, adult and remedial) other than the transfer.

Lombadi, John. *The Decline of Transfer Education*, Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper Number 70, December 1979.

Despite exhortations by junior college educators, leaders of the national and state associations and many non-educators to add more vocational courses and programs, the ratio of transfer education to vocational education remained high almost to the end of the 1960s. Eells' comment in 1940 that "the students show little interest in terminal [vocational] aspects of education" was repeated by many observers during the next 25 years (1941). Medsker in 1960 wrote that "the extent of the terminal program is limited more by student interest than by the willingness of colleges to offer it" (1960). He added that the "difficulty is the prestige values that pertain to 'regular' college work" (1960). Six years later Thornton wrote that transfer "is still the function on which the junior colleges expend most effort and in which most of their students express interest" (1966). After analyzing the occupational offerings in 511 public junior colleges in 1967, Smith reported that they "accord transfer education continued emphasis, and though the number of different occupational offerings has increased, the number of junior colleges offering occupational curriculum has not increased substantially" (Smith, 1969).

However, the turn away from transfer education was in the making even while critics were lamenting the indifference of educators to the "real" needs of the students and pondering the failure of students to see that their future lay in other directions than transfer. Data from state reports show that enrollments in transfer education and transfers to senior institutions were not increasing as rapidly as total enrollments or as enrollments in vocational or community education.

It is difficult to pinpoint trends without meeting problems relating to definitions, enrollment variables and interpretations of the developments. The definitions of transfer used in this discussion are those that have been current until recent years. Emphasis is on public community colleges, although it is acknowledged that national and state data do not always separate community colleges from other postsecondary institutions. National data may include non-public colleges; state data are often exclusively of public colleges. In general, the discussion emphasizes relative and absolute change. It will cover definitions, enrollments, transfers to senior institutions, causes of the decline of transfer education, and prospects for the near future.

Definitions

Transfer education has two major aspects: 1) Courses and programs and 2) the movement of students.

In the first it is defined as the large body of credit courses in the liberal arts and sciences, general education, and humanities areas that are equivalent to the lower division course in a baccalaureate institution. Until the recent multiplication of curricular functions, the transfer function was often referred to as the non-vocational or academic function. This neat dichotomy no longer prevails, because the colleges have added new or have expanded old functions, such as continuing education, adult education, community services, community education, development education. Transfer courses may be included in the new functions but the students enrolled may have goals other than a degree or transfer to another institution.

Transfer education courses have always been essential for career education students not only to meet general education requirements for an associate degree but also to meet these and other liberal arts requirements for transfer to a senior institution. But the categories shift constantly and it is likely that, as formerly, courses that today are labelled non-transfer will become transfer as senior colleges introduce technical courses and programs in their curriculum. Nor is the term, transfer, itself distinct. Colleges and state agencies sometimes use one of the following terms more or less synonymously: Academic (Washington); Advanced and Professional (Florida); Baccalaureate-Oriented (Illinois); College Parallel (Iowa); Liberal Arts and Sciences (New York City); Lower Division Collegiate (Oregon).

In the second definition transfer education is the process whereby students progress from the community college to a four-year institution. The definition of a transfer student for statistical purposes varies from state to state. For example, New York classifies as a transfer anyone from a two-year institution whether he has no transferable credits or 60 (State University of New York, 1976). New Jersey's minimum is one (Miller, 1976). For statistical purposes California universities classify as transfers those who have earned a minimum of 12 acceptable transfer credits (California State Postsecondary Education Commission, 1978).

In recent years, the process has been expanded to include all transfers, those from one community college to another (intrasector transfers) and from a four-year institution to a community college (reverse transfers). Of the 27,745 transfers entering a New York two-year institution in the fall of 1974 36.5 percent were intrasector and reverse transfers (State University of New York, 1976). More than 19,000 enrollees in the Illinois colleges in the fall of 1976 were intrasector and reverse transfers (Illinois Community College Board, 1976b). The Washington transfer data for 1978 breaks down as follows: 2,130 or 45 percent intrasector; 2,622 or 55 percent reverse. This compares with 3,852 regular transfers (Meir and Story, 1979). Knoell and Others discovered that reverse transfers in California were primarily part-time students who had enrolled in the community colleges for "one semester in order to satisfy some requirement or gain some skill which would help them in upper division and/or graduate work" (1976). Although the intrasector and reverse transfers are extensive (see Lee's 1976 study for a succinct account) they will receive no more attention in this study, which is concerned with the original meaning of transfer: from the community college to a four-year institution.

It should also be noted that although the original meaning of the transfer process excluded the vocational students, today, students of vocational and career programs are being accepted for transfer. In the gross statistics these are often indistinguishable from the liberal arts transfers, although studies are beginning to include them as a separate category. A few studies deal exclusively with career education transfer (Heller and Others, 1978). As a result of this development the distinction between academic and vocational is becoming blurred as more senior colleges accept for transfer vocational and career education graduates. The proportion of these transfers is still moderate but the growth is significant especially among community colleges with selective admission (Heller and Others, 1978). In California 36 percent of the associate degree transfers to the State University System had an occupationally oriented major (California State Postsecondary Education Commission, 1979); in New York State in 1974 the comparable figure was 30 percent (State University of New York, 1976). In time, as Knoell and Medsker recommended, educators will "cease referring to programs as 'terminal' [vocational] and 'transfer';" and universities and four-year colleges will "recognize the student's right to be either terminal or transfer in either type of program" (1965).

Enrollment in Transfer Courses

The predominance of transfer enrollment was of long standing. Blocker and Others (1965) point out that the early legislation establishing junior colleges emphasized that the secondary schools should be permitted to extend their programs for an additional two years and/or provide college-transfer programs at their discretion. Often, as in Texas, state funding was limited to courses which also appeared in the offerings of four-year colleges in the state. Though later legislation broadened this to include vocational education, the colleges remained essentially lower division institutions.

From 1907 to 1940, transfer education comprised 60 to 70 percent of the enrollment. In Eells' 1929 study of 10,000 students in 42 California junior colleges, over 8,000 indicated transfer goals. Ten years later (1938–39) two-thirds of the 41,000 students in 190 public junior colleges were enrolled in preparatory courses (Eells, 1941). Little change took place during the next 20 years. In the fall of 1956, Medsker found that 64 percent of the 54,000 students in 70 two-year institutions in 15 states were enrolled in transfer programs. One state, Oregon, reported no transfer enrollment; it was matched by Wisconsin which reported no terminal enrollment. Except for New York's 6 percent transfer enrollment, the rest ranged from 53 percent for Pennsylvania to 96 percent for Iowa. California, which accounted for 52 percent of the total enrollment, had a transfer enrollment of 67 percent (Medsker, 1960).

The balance began to tip downward during the late 1960s. By 1973, less than 43 percent of the students were enrolled in transfer programs (Parker, 1974a). Brawer and Associates have documented the decline of the humanities (especially transfer or nonvocational courses) subject by subject. Between the spring of 1975 and spring of 1977 she noted that enrollment in the humanities declined by 3 percent while total enrollment was rising by 7 percent. The range for the humanities was from a 3 percent decline in cultural geography to 13 percent in literature. The exceptions—political science and interdisciplinary humanities—rose by 4 and 6 percent respectively (Brawer, 1978).

An analysis of enrollment in nine states, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, shows that while transfer enrollment was higher in the middle 1970s than in the late 1960s in each of the states, the proportion of transfer enrollment to the total enrollment declined in all but Hawaii and Nevada. Only in Florida and Washington was the proportion of transfer students in the 1970s higher than 50 percent (Lombardi, 1978).

Illustrative of the shifting balance is the Illinois experience. In 1968, transfer students represented 56 percent of the total enrollments; in 1970, 44 percent; in 1974, 37 percent; in 1978, 32 percent. During this period transfer enrollment more than doubled from 50,000 to 103,000, but the total enrollment of 322,000 of 1978 was more than 3 times the 1968 enrollment of 102,000 (Illinois Community College Board, 1976a, 1976b, 1979b). Transfer enrollment fell behind occupational enrollments in 1977, then regained its lead in 1978. It has been lower than the general studies/undeclared categories since 1976.

The shift in enrollment balance in some states, Iowa and Florida for example, is in part accounted for by the transfer of jurisdiction over adult and vocational education to the community colleges. The change in Iowa, where vocational schools and colleges were combined into area schools, is most pronounced. In 1956, transfer enrollment comprised 96 percent of the total enrollment; in 1968, 46 percent; in 1975, 24 percent. In Florida a similar development on a smaller scale accounts for the decline of transfer enrollment from 73 percent in 1970 to 62 percent in 1976. This change of functions will continue as more public schools give up or are forced to relinquish their jurisdiction over adult education.

Degrees awarded in the arts and sciences also reflect the decline in transfer education. In 1970 A.A. degrees awarded represented 54.3 percent of the total. By 1976 the proportion dropped to 42 percent (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979d).

At last, during the 1970s, the first-time, full-time freshmen started to act as Eells and his fellow critics thought they should; today only 42 percent of them plan to obtain a bachelor's degree (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979b). Moreover "there appears to be more indecision about going to college than there was five years ago." In 1974 68 percent of high school students in Ocean County, New Jersey had aspirations of going to college, in 1979 the percentage dropped to 59 percent (Parrish, 1979). In the First Report of a California longitudinal study of enrollment patterns Gold concluded: "The image of the community college student being an 18 year old just out of high school planning to stay four semesters and then transfer to a four year university is correct only for a small percentage of students" (1979).

Transfers to Four-Year Colleges and Universities

To evaluate the extent to which the community colleges fulfill their oldest function, preparation for baccalaureate education, numerous follow-up studies are undertaken by colleges, state authorities, and independent researchers. The absorption in these endeavors attests to the high priority educators place on the transfer function and to the concern of critics that the effort expended on transfer education is not warranted by the results. Most educators agree with Cosand that the colleges, were, are, and will be evaluated to a major degree upon the success of their transfer students to the four-year colleges and universities" (1979). The critics point to the studies to support Eells' thesis that "*the junior college is terminal, as far as full-time formal education is concerned, for three-quarters of its students who enter as freshmen*" (1941).

Although there have been many studies on transfers to the senior institutions, there has been little discussion on what is an optimum or acceptable percentage or number of transfers. Both the college administrators and the critics are silent on this issue, except for such statements that the percentage is low and that the "impact of the transfer process must be assessed . . . in light of both actual numbers of transfer students and their growth rates" (Miller, 1976).

Educators take the position, openly or implied, that in an open door college the number will be small; were it otherwise, the commitment to the open door might be less than wholehearted.

Educators are gratified when a large percentage of students transfer; but they are more likely to stress the accomplishments of those who transfer as measured by high grade point averages (GPA), and more so if these averages are equal to or higher than those of the native students. Also gratifying to the educators are a high percentage of transferees who earn a "B" or better GPA and a high percentage who graduate (Martinko, 1978; Rinehart, 1977). Notwithstanding, the large number of studies and the elaborate analyses that accompany them belie a deep-seated concern about the low number and proportion of transfers and the still lower proportion of minorities and disadvantaged among them.

Follow-up transfer studies are far from uniform. They may concentrate on first-time transfers, transfers attending senior institutions at a given term, transfers who completed a minimum number of units or terms, transfers to the state public institutions. For comparative purposes they use headcount enrollment, full-time equivalent enrollment, graduates, four-year undergraduate enrollment. Longitudinal studies are made to show the trend in the number or proportion of transfers. Often, a particular class is studied for period of three or more years. Occasionally, a study may seek to determine the number and proportion of transfers over a long period, sometimes as long as 25 years.

The statistics from the different studies are not comparable because of differences in data gathering and classifications. For the same reasons, sometimes even data from the same state may not be exactly comparable. The differences in the various studies are easily spotted in the descriptions. In many of the studies the sample represents a fraction of the total transfers. (See Cohen, 1979, for an analysis of the vagaries in reporting transfer data.)

National Studies

In a national study in 1937-38, Eells (1941) reported that the average percentage of transfers from public community colleges was 18 with a range by region of 17 to 26, the lowest from California and the highest from the middle states. In a large scale study of 17,627 freshmen entering in Fall 1952 in 63 colleges, Medsker (1960) found that by June 1956, a median of 33 percent had transferred with a range among the 63 colleges of 10 to 67. The percentage of graduates who transferred was 56 with a range of 10 to 87. According to a more recent national study of the students enrolled in 1972, about one-fourth had transferred within two years (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979a).

College and State Transfer Studies

The large number of college and state studies provides insights on a variety of aspects of this absorbing phenomenon. Of the 19,000 students enrolled in Kansas City Junior College between 1915 and 1950, 3,000 or 16 percent enrolled in a senior institution (Eells, 1941). In a similar longitudinal study at Everett Junior College (Washington), covering the 1948 to 1958 period, 47 percent had transferred compared with 80 percent who chose transfer as their goal (Blocker and Others, 1965). Two earlier California studies in 1929 and 1932 had percentages of 21 and 19 respectively (Eells, 1941), percentages considerably higher than those since 1965. According to a study of transfers to the University of California and the California State University and Colleges the percentage of transfers in Fall 1965 was 3.6, increased to 5 percent in 1972, and then declined to 3.7 in 1977. The number of transfers increased by 130 percent but enrollment during the same period increased by 341 percent (California State Postsecondary Education Commission, 1978). Higher yearly percentages of about 5 percent are obtained when full year transfers to the State University and Colleges are used instead of Fall term transfers. For 1969, the first year for which full year numbers are given, and 1976, the last year, the numbers of transfers changed to 48,421 and 58,353 from 32,665 and 39,776 respectively. The percentage of transfers to total enrollment for 1976 rises from 3.6 to 5.3 (California State Postsecondary Education Commission, 1978).

A 1969 Florida study of first-time freshmen enrolled in the fall of 1966 reported that 31 percent had transferred to a four-year college. Of the graduates, 75 percent had transferred; of the non-graduates only 13 percent had done so. Of those with degrees, 82 percent had transfer degrees; 13 percent had technical-vocational degrees; the rest other degrees (Florida Community Junior College Inter-institutional Research Council, 1969).

Summary

Because of the absence of a criterion or standard, the studies from the colleges and state boards rarely discuss the question of the ideal percentage of transfers. The studies indicate that there is wide variation in the percentage of the students who transfer and that the growth rate of transfers has been lower than that for enrollment.

Nearly all studies of transfers to the senior institution point out that full timers and persisters (those who enroll for two or more consecutive semesters) are more likely to enroll in transfer programs than part timers and nonpersisters

(Florida State Department of Education, 1977a; California State Postsecondary Education Commission, 1979; Anderson, 1977; Hauselman and Tudor, 1977; Wetzel, 1977).

Based on state and national studies, the percentage of students transferring to a senior institution ranges between 2 and 30. The percentage of community college graduates who transfer lies somewhere between 45 percent and 75 percent.

If the part-time student enrollment continues to increase at a higher rate than the full-time student enrollment, the percentage of transfers to senior institutions will approach the California and Washington average of 3 to 5 percent of the total enrollment. An important counteracting influence on the percentage will be the increasing number of transfers with occupational majors.

The low percentage of transfers will be in states that have given jurisdiction of adult and vocational education to the community colleges; have a very high proportion of part-time and older students; have a low selective admission policy; and have a high minority population. The high percentages will come from states and colleges that have students from high income families, that maintain some matriculation requirements, and that are close to public senior institutions.

Forces at Work

How much of the relative and absolute enrollment decline of transfer education is the result of positive efforts of the educators and how much of the external forces is not easy to determine. It is undeniable that much effort in this direction came from educators who from conviction based on the changing character of the students or from the desire to maintain enrollment or from other motives added the new functions that had the effect of reducing the importance of transfer education in the total curriculum area. But it is also reasonable to assert that the decline of transfer education is a natural development for an institution which maintains an open door policy and which takes pride in its flexibility and ability to meet the needs of its students.

Of the many causes (some of which have already been mentioned) that contributed to the decline of transfer education, major attention will be given to the following:

1. the introduction and the promotion of vocation education;
2. the addition of community education functions;
3. the growth of remedial education;
4. competition from four-year colleges;

5. the tremendous increase of part-time day students; and
6. the aging of the population.

These are not mutually exclusive nor are they discrete. The order bears some relation to the sequence of the happening.

Vocational Education

In light of its origins, the strong hold of transfer education as measured by courses and enrollment and the desire of some educators for senior status, it may sound implausible to assert that almost as soon as public junior colleges appeared in the early 1900s, agitation began for the addition of vocational education to the curriculum and that by 1940, the national leaders were declaring that occupational education "is . . . the most significant aspect of the rapidly spreading junior college movement" (Eells, 1941). Ever since, a succession of educators, legislators, community leaders, and national commissions and foundations have urged community college educators to introduce more occupational courses and programs and to downplay transfer education. Congress and state legislatures encourage the development of vocational education through generous appropriations and stand by state policies setting goals and/or requirements that a specified percentage of the courses and curriculums be devoted to vocational education. Because of state and national partiality to vocational education, community college educators have gone to great pains not only to increase enrollments in vocational education, but to document their efforts. For example, in a Fact Sheet on enrollment the California Community and Junior College Association included a special section on vocational education informing its readers that "about 40 percent of total student instruction hours . . . are in occupational programs, [and that] approximately two-thirds of students . . . are enrolled in one or more voc-ed qualifying classes" (California Community and Junior College Association, 1979a).

It took more than 50 years before this campaign succeeded. In the 1970s, transfer enrollment dropped below occupational enrollment. Not to be overlooked in this shift is the high unemployment among the college graduates during the early years of the 1970s. As the articles and books on the "Overeducated American" multiplied, vocational education courses and programs became more acceptable to the regular community college students and in some degree to unemployed college graduates who sought a skill for temporary employment (Freeman, 1976; Hurn, 1979).

Community Education

Since the middle 1950s, a new group of curriculum functions—community services, continuing education, adult education, and adult basic education—has contributed to the relative decline of transfer education. This group, often called community education, is growing at a faster rate than either vocational or transfer education. Unlike vocational education courses and programs, which are nearly always classified as college level, the new group contains courses, programs, and activities which are admittedly below college level, are offered in the day or evening, on-campus and off-campus, in rented or borrowed facilities. Most of the students or participants served are not interested in degrees, some are not even interested in credits. A large number have degrees, are employed, or are senior citizens. The great majority are older than the traditional 18 to 24 college-age group. This group of functions is being promoted vigorously by advocates who are even more committed to the subordination of the transfer function than the vocational education proponents.

Nearly all states authorize community colleges to offer courses and programs in these subjects although in most states the jurisdiction is shared with the public schools. In time, community college educators expect to have major responsibility. They maintain "that community colleges, through their locally elected [and appointed] governing boards, are best suited to fulfill the educational needs of students over age 18 because of their community orientation and ability to respond to the diverse educational and vocational needs of the adult community" (California Community and Junior College Association, 1979b). A few also are frank to admit that they need "the over 3 million Illinois adult residents who do not possess at least a high school diploma" in order to offset the declining enrollments and the consequent lower state aid (Illinois Community College Board, 1979a).

Remedial Education

The increase of high school graduates with inadequate preparation for college-level work poses a serious threat to transfer education. Where the proportion of low-aptitude students is unusually high, the offerings in transfer education courses decline and those in remedial education increase. Whereas in a normal college the proportion of enrollment in transfer courses (e.g., English or mathematics) is 70 percent, in a college with a large remedial student body the proportion may only be 30 or 40 percent (Carnevale, 1978). As a result advanced courses in most transfer subjects cannot be offered every semester; at best they can be offered only once every second or third semester. In such colleges the flight of high aptitude students resembles the flight of white students from inner-city schools. This is especially pronounced in multicampus districts where high-aptitude students gravitate toward the suburban campus. Throughout the country there are a number of colleges in multicampus districts and some in single-campus districts which offer only a semblance of transfer education. Such an environment not only discourages high-aptitude students, it also creates a morale problem among faculty who, academically unprepared and often unsympathetic, find teaching remedial students overwhelmingly discouraging.

Paradoxically, adult basic education which consists of less than college-grade courses does not affect the status of transfer education as does remedial education because the courses are for students who have not graduated from high school. These students are usually adults attending during the evening on a part-time basis and enrolled in elementary or high school subjects. Their instructors, who are usually prepared for the task, do not expect college performance. On the other hand remedial students are often high school graduates attending during the day who want college subjects for transfer purposes. Their instructors are the same as those who teach college transfer courses. The important difference between the two is that adult basic education does not impinge on transfer education while remedial education is directly related to transfer education since the courses are often a prerequisite for transfer courses and most of the students aspire to transfer status.

Competition for Students

Another development that contributes directly to the decline of transfer education is the frantic search for students by four-year colleges and universities through proliferation of marginal off-campus and out-of-state degree programs, awarding of academic credit for insufficient and inadequate work, and grade inflation (Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1979). This situation may make a shambles of those master plans for higher education that have as their link-pin the diversion of lower division students to the community colleges. If the competition persists, the percentage of the full-time college-bound high school graduates enrolling in community colleges will decrease.

Part-Time Students

Overriding all of these reasons is the growth of the part-time student phenomenon. This includes the full-time intermittent or drop-in students as well as those who attend on a part-time basis. During the late 1950s and early 1960s educators expounded on the virtue of young people interrupting their formal educations in order to travel, work, or engage in some political or civic activity. At the same time, the colleges attracted or recruited large numbers of women, retired people, young people who had to work while going to college, and others with degrees who took special courses for personal improvement. Today, 50 percent of the day students attend part time. When these are added to the very large numbers of evening division students, preponderantly part timers, the proportion rises to two-thirds or more of the enrollees. Many part-time students enroll in transfer courses but not for transfer purposes. Knoell and Others noted that "continuing education for part-time, adult students has become the dominant function of the Community Colleges" and that these students "come with their own objectives relating to educational, career, and personal growth which often are achieved outside degree and certificate programs" (1976).

Age of Community College Students

Related to the part-time pattern is the aging of the community college student body. In 1970, the under-20 group represented 52 percent of total enrollment. By 1977, the percentage dropped to 37. The 22–34 age group percentages for the same years were 31 and 45 respectively. Of the California transfers "Seventy-three percent and sixty percent of the University and State University transfer students, respectively, were under the age of 20 when they entered the Community College." Only 47 percent of the entire community college enrollment was under 20 years of age (California State Postsecondary Education Commission, 1979). The mean age of Florida transfers attending the state university institutions was between 24 and 25 during the 1974–1976 period (Florida State Department of Education, 1977a).

Current Status

It may seem contradictory to maintain that transfer education still retains a great deal of appeal while pointing out that enrollment in transfer education is declining absolutely and relatively to vocational and community education.

Nevertheless, such is the situation. This is evident in the efforts made in vocational education to transform as many courses and programs as possible into transfer courses and programs and in community education where the efforts are directed toward converting courses into college credit courses. The allure of the baccalaureate is ever present, despite the small numbers achieving it. For some colleges the allure is financial since transfer courses are funded at a higher rate than non-credit courses.

This ambivalence or love-hate relationship toward transfer education is particularly noticeable in the actions of educators, who support and encourage the growth of transfer education because it is their principal connection with higher education. They go to great lengths to strengthen this relationship by fashioning transfer courses to conform to the lower division format, sometimes adopting the senior college course titles, numbers, units, and content. They take inordinate pride in the success of their transfers at the senior institutions. For many it is the most important criterion in the evaluation of the community college's effectiveness. At the same time they vigorously promote occupational education and community education functions. Sometimes, they even look on transfer education as a drag on the development of a broader mission for the college. They bemoan the effort expended on transfer education since it is out of proportion to the small number of students who transfer.

Indicative of the longstanding ambivalent attitude of educators toward transfer education were reactions to the California Master Plan for Higher Education which made the community college a co-partner with the state colleges and the university. Ambivalency is also noticeable in state and college policies that set goals of a fifteen to fifty percent enrollment in occupational programs and establish minimum general education requirements for the associate degree in applied arts (Illinois Community College Board, 1979a). More indicative of this ambivalency are the efforts to elevate occupational programs to transfer status and to convert nontraditional, noncredit courses to transfer credit status.

In contrast there is no ambivalency among leaders of national and state associations. Gleazer, president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, has been in the forefront of this effort to downplay the transfer function. In addition to their own speeches and writings, association leaders invite prominent laypersons and public officials to their conventions to propound the virtues of vocational and community education. At national and state conferences rarely is a major speaker invited to make a plea for transfer education. Also indicative of this attitude toward transfer education is a plethora of committees and commissions on vocational education, adult education, continuing education, community services, and their absence on transfer education. In a listing of 15 "Programs in Progress at AACJC"—energy, community resource centers, college-labor union cooperation, community education, lifelong education, career education, older Americans, veterans affairs, adult learning, women business owners, international services—not one related specifically to the transfer function (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1979c).

Based solely on statistics, a case could be made for changing the institutional character of the community college. The proportion of students enrolled in transfer courses is approximately one-third of the total enrollment and the proportion of students who transfer is less than 10 percent of the total enrollment. It is very likely that the proportion will approach 5 percent, if the present trends of lower enrollments of the 18- to 24-year-olds and higher enrollments of part-time students continue.

Despite the statistics and the addition of programs and courses that are below college level or remedial in nature, community college educators cling tenaciously to their higher education association. Gleazer's suggestion that the community college become "a new kind of college—standing between the high school and the university—offering broad programs of experiences of value in and of themselves, neither post high school as such or precollege such" (1964) has few supporters. Even fewer embrace Pifer's recommendation that the colleges "consider themselves primarily as community service agencies rather than institutions of higher education" (Talbott, 1976).

A good deal of support for transfer education comes from students and leaders of minority groups who object to the concentration on non-academic programs—remedial and vocational—in colleges with large minority enrollments. In the Cuyahoga Community College District (Cleveland, Ohio) the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) reported the complaints of students that "'meat courses' had been removed from the downtown campus . . . [and] 'go nowhere' courses" are left for them (Middleton, 1978). The Cuyahoga incident may be the beginning of a new wave of protests against "inferior" nontransfer education reminiscent of the black and Chicano student demands of the 1960s. These protests and "affirmative action efforts . . . [are] likely to increase the transfer rates . . . from racial/ethnic minority groups" (California State Postsecondary Education Commission, 1979). The recent policy that makes transfer students eligible for federally funded aid, while applicable to all transfers, will be especially helpful to low-income students.

Future

Will the transfer function disappear? Hardly. The colleges will continue to offer liberal arts, sciences, general education courses and they will create transfer programs—including some in vocational education—but the enrollees in the courses will include more than formerly those who do not want, are not capable of, or cannot sustain the regimen of a two- or three-year sequence. The decline of transfer enrollment and transfers to senior institutions will continue.

Community colleges will have serious competition from the senior institutions for baccalaureate-oriented students. They have some advantage in lower tuition and fees, in lower entrance requirements, and in proximity to potential students. However, if the difference in tuition keeps narrowing as in New York State, the financial advantage will be lost. The lower entrance requirement will help to some extent, but the difference here will be slight, except in the case of applicants with very low aptitude in reading, writing, and arithmetic skills. Most senior institutions will draw the line here. Proximity is still an important asset to the community colleges and may become even more so if the energy crisis is not resolved. On the other hand, if the percentage of college-going students (18- to 24-year range) keeps going down, the efforts of four-year colleges to enroll a larger proportion will be redoubled.

Community college educators have an opportunity to capitalize on the new interest in strengthening transfer education. Perhaps leaders in the movement should consider mounting a study similar to that on terminal education led in 1940 by the American Junior College Association. Under Eells' leadership and supported by most presidents, this commission called attention to the importance of vocational education and laid the foundation for its acceptance as an equal to transfer education. In such a study community college educators should be able to demonstrate the importance to American youth of transfer education as the beginning of the process in career education. They could make a case that for the underprivileged transfer education is an essential if they are ever to achieve the goal of participating in the mainstream. At the same time they must examine the serious assertion that enrollment in a community college reduces the student's chances of obtaining a bachelor's degree. Is this assertion related to the charge that many colleges offer minuscule third and fourth semester offerings? What evidence is there that community colleges have become two-semester rather than two-year colleges?

While making this plea for bolstering the transfer function, there is no intention of besmirching vocational or community education. The community college is strong enough to perform all three functions. What is suggested is that transfer not be neglected because it involves a greater effort or because it is more difficult for the students. Sometimes one wonders if community college educators are being enticed toward other areas because they want to parade numbers, or because they fear failure in the transfer function, or because in community education areas accountability is not a problem.

While we are convinced that transfer education will not in the near future (as far ahead as 2000) regain the preeminent position it once held, nevertheless we believe that there is still logic and justice to the ideal of universal higher education through the sophomore year—and that the community college which is the entry point to higher education for the great majority of students continues to have an important role in the fulfillment of this ideal.

References

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1979a). Follow-up and transfer of two-year college students. Washington, DC.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1979b). Learners in two-year colleges. Washington, DC.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1979c). Programs in progress at AACJC. Washington, DC.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (1979d). Types of programs offered in two-year colleges. Washington, DC.

Anderson, E. F. (1977). *Three year comparison of transfer and native student progress at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Campaign, fall, 1973 group. Research memorandum 77–79.* Urbana: University of Illinois, Office of School and College Relations.

Blocker, C. E., Plummer, R. H., & Richardson, R. C., Jr. (1965). *The two-year college: A social synthesis.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Brawer, F. B. (Ed.). (1978). *The humanities in two-year colleges: Trends in curriculum.* Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges and Center for the Study for Community Colleges.

California Community and Junior College Association. (March 1979a). CCJCA prepares community college fact sheet. *CCJCA News, 24*(6), 1–2.

California Community and Junior College Association. (March 1979b). Community colleges best suited to teach adults. *CCJCA News, 24*(6), 5.

California State Postsecondary Education Commission. (1978). *Access in a broader context: College-going rates in California.* Sacramento, CA.

California State Postsecondary Education Commission. (1979). *California community college students who transfer. A continuation of through the open door: A study of patterns of enrollment and performance in California's community colleges.* Sacramento, CA.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1979). *Fair practices in higher education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Carnevale, T. A. (1978). *Qualifications of the two-year college mathematics teachers: What are they, what should they be?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, San Diego, CA.

Cohen, A. M. (1979). *Counting the transfer students. Junior college resource review.* Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

Cosand, J. P. (1979). *Perspective: Community colleges in the 1980s.* Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Council of Universities and Colleges; and Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

Eells, W. C. (1941). *Why junior college terminal education?* Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges.

Florida Community Junior College Inter-institutional Research Council. (1969). *Where are they now? A follow-up of first time in college freshmen in Florida's community junior colleges in fall 1966.* Gainesville, FL.

Florida State Department of Education. (1977a). *Articulation.* Tallahassee, FL: Division of Community Colleges.

Freeman, R. B. (1976). *The overeducated American.* New York: Academic Press.

Gleazer, E. J., Jr. (March, 1964). The two-year college. *College and University Business, 36*(3), 49.

Gold, B. K. (1979). *The statewide longitudinal study: First report. Research study #79-11.* Los Angeles: Los Angeles City College.

Hauselman, A. J., & Tudor, D. (1977). *Compendium of selected data and characteristics, 1976–1977.* Lexington: University of Kentucky, Community College System.

Heller, B. R., & Others. (1978). *1973 career graduates: A profile of CUNY community college students.* New York: City University of New York, Graduate School and University Center.

Hurn, C. J. (1979). The prospects for liberal education: A sociologial perspective. *Phi Delta Kappan, 60*(9), 630–633.

Illinois Community College Board. (January, 1979b). Public community colleges. *Illinois Community College Bulletin, 13*(6), 3–6.

Illinois Community College Board. (February–March 1979a). Illinois community colleges seventh biennial report 1977–1978. *Illinois Community College Bulletin, 13*(6), 3–10.

Illinois Community College Board. (1976b). *Student enrollment data and trends in the public community colleges of Illinois: Fall 1975, second term FY 1976, and fall 1976. Data and characteristics volume IV number 1 [and] volume V number 2.* Springfield, IL.

Knoell, D. M., & Medsker, L. L. (1965). *From junior to senior college: A national study of the transfer student.* Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Knoell, D., & Others. (1976). *Through the open door; a study of patterns of enrollment and performance in California's community colleges. Report 76-1.* Sacramento: California State Postsecondary Education Commission.

Lee, R. (Fall, 1976). An ERIC review: Reverse transfer students. *Community College Review*, *4*(2), 64–70.

Lombardi, J. (1978). *Resurgence of occupational education. Topical paper number 65*. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges.

Martinko, A. (1978). *Success of transfer students in Pennsylvania*. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania State Department of Education.

Medsker, L. L. (1960). *The junior college: Progress and prospect*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Meier, T., & Story, S. (1979). *Washington community colleges factbook*. Olympia: Washington State Board for Community College Education.

Middleton, L. (1978). NAACP concerned over "racial isolation" in Cleveland's community colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *16*(15), 9.

Miller, H. F., Jr. (1976). *New Jersey two-year college transfer students. Research report 76-1*. Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Higher Education.

Moughamian, H., & Others. (1978). *A statewide follow-up study of students who transfer from Illinois public community colleges to Illinois four-year colleges and universities. Fall 1973 transfer students followed through spring 1976*. Springfield: Illinois Community College Board.

Parker, G. G. (1974a). *Career education and transfer program enrollment in 2-year colleges, 1973–74. ACT special report 11*. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program.

Parrish, R. M. (1979). *Survey of educational goals Ocean County high school juniors and seniors*. Toms River, NJ: Ocean County College.

Rinehart, R. (1977). Assessing successful articulation of transfer students. *New directions for community colleges: Assessing student academic and social progress*, *5*(2), 37–50.

Ryan, M. (1979). *The mature woman in higher education: What's a nice old girl like you doing in a place like this*? Unpublished paper.

Smith, R. B. (1969). *Do curriculums reflect purposes*? Unpublished paper.

State University of New York. (1976). *Application and enrollment patterns of transfer students, fall 1974. Report number 6-76*. Albany, NY: Central Staff Office of Institutional Research.

Talbott, L. H. (1976). Community problem-solving. *New directions for community colleges: Reaching out through community service*, *4*(2), 83–91.

Thornton, J. W., Jr. (1966). *The community junior college*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Wetzel, S. (1977). *Student outcomes survey for 1975–76 program completers. Part I*. Media, PA: Delaware County Community College.

Chapter 9

THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE STUDENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

This discussion describes community services as they are viewed today and briefly indicates some of the contemporary phenomena that make them a vital function for community colleges. No claim is made that community colleges have a prior or exclusive mandate for performing this function. Community services embrace so many activities that no single agency is capable of performing all of them. They are in fact being performed by a myriad of agencies and individuals, and as far in the future as is now visible, will continue to be.

Development

Historically, our colleges have offered their communities services beyond the formal academic and vocational programs, the extent dependent on the college's location, resources, and imagination of personnel. The commitment has also undergone different orientations as priorities have changed from time to time. Today, with the help of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 the concept has taken on new, expanded meaning.

There seems to be very little doubt that community service is a proper function of a community college. Some states encourage colleges to provide services either by authorizing a special tax or by special funding such as was approved in Illinois where a $7.50 per equivalent credit hour was provided for community education, consisting of noncredit workshops, seminars and short courses while a lump sum project subsidy was made available for community services defined as conferences, advisory services, consulting bureaus, and

---

Lombardi, John. "Community Services for the Community Colleges of the 70's," *The Two-Year College Student and Community Services*, ed. Don A. Morgan, Rochester, Minn.: University of Minnesota, 1974, 2–11.

institutes. Colleges may still and often must use local funds to offer services that are not reimbursable.

Originally, a major objective in community services was to bring the community to the college. In this community colleges have been fairly active by making facilities available to groups, keeping athletic areas open on weekends and during the evenings, inviting the public to student plays, art exhibits, musical performances, award activities, athletic contests, and cooperating with special purpose groups. Renowned artists, gymnasts, symphonies, speakers, rock festivals, and other professional performers from abroad as well as from our own country have been engaged. More recently planetariums and museums have been built and centers established for drug information, human resources, job preparation, community learning, senior citizens, and the study of urban problems. A few years ago centers for Selective Service information were popular in certain colleges.

But this is not the whole story. The expanded meaning of community services involves taking the college to the community. Nearly all colleges retain an immobile campus site and nearly all believe there is a need for a base for our activities and a place for our students and community who wish to associate with a collegiate institution. These components of community services must not be underrated. For most of our colleges, they are the most important ingredients. But, many people do not or cannot come to the college. For them there are many ways to take services to them, via radio, television, vans, etc.

Location

Many colleges use mobile vans, reminiscent of the mobile library and mobile X-ray units, to bring counseling, classes, and other services to the community. In addition, space is leased in stores, churches and temples, high schools and office buildings, as well as swimming pools, golf courses, tennis courts, and other recreational facilities.

Students are enlisted in a voluntary or paid capacity to act as peer counselors and tutors to elementary and secondary school students and juvenile hall residents, and to serve the needs of elderly citizens. These activities join those of other community agencies to perform functions that emerge naturally from our educational mission. Such activities as Inner-City Project and Outreach Program point up the involvement of the college in the community.

The ultimate in this new concept is to obliterate the distinction between campus and community. A few colleges, more daring than most, go the full route of integrating the college with a community by abandoning the fixed campus. Vermont Community College has no campus, rather, it has a series of locations in stores, libraries, and schools throughout the state. It offers its services to a community and when the need is fulfilled, it closes shop to move to another location. Likewise, Whatcom College in Washington conducts classes and other activities in rented facilities throughout the district. Wayne County Community College, Michigan, to a larger extent than most and probably from necessity, establishes classes and services in many places throughout the county, including Detroit. Flathead Valley Community College in Montana provides services all over its area in whatever buildings are available.

In the expanded meaning community services implies that community colleges are integral parts of the community, not separate from the community. For example, placing colleges in the community rather than apart from the community reverses the pre-World War II pattern of locating our colleges away from the centers of population. The ivory-tower stereotypes of a college have been given up—reluctantly. This change in itself demonstrates the larger commitment being made to community services.

Needs—The Basis for Services

Success in community services depends on the ability of those in charge to gauge the needs of the community. Indiscriminant borrowing of ideas and programs, preconceived notions of what the community needs, and poorly planned activities cause many failures and may lead to the discredit of this function. The needs of the people in the District of Columbia with an area of 61 square miles and a population of 757,000, with the large number of attractions available and a fair public transportation system, contrast with the needs of a community in Flathead County, Montana, of 5,000 square miles and a population of 39,000, most of it concentrated in four towns with practically no public transportation.

Community colleges situated near the 1,300 rural counties whose people (mostly young) are moving to the metropolitan areas may have to make drastic reorientation of functions that will help those who migrate and those who remain at home. Advising those who are likely to emigrate will require a great deal of tact and sensitivity to the feelings of those who deplore the exodus of their young people. Yet, those who leave need help, just as those who remain. This population change also creates opportunities for the community colleges in the city and suburbs that receive the flow of young people. What services can they provide to make a smooth adjustment for these young people? A more complex problem is to determine what efforts the college should take in retarding or encouraging the movement.

Our colleges need to plan for meeting the problems that accompany a near-stationary or declining population. The ability to allocate more resources to community services may even enable some colleges to survive; for it seems quite certain that for the rest of the century, enrollments of the traditional college-age youth will stabilize or decline since there will be fewer of them. Today, the average age of our population is 28 years; by 2000 it will be 36 years. Today, 53 percent of the population is under 30 years, by 2000 it will be 44 percent. Those over 65 are increasing at a faster rate than the population. The "Greening of America" is being succeeded by the "Graying of America." Along with the graying we will have more leisure—each day, each week, each year, as our working hours are reduced, our vacations increased, and our retirements lengthened. If the trends toward lower working hours, later entry into and earlier retirement from the work force continue, the need for community services will become more acute than ever.

Many of the eligible young will come to our colleges, but a great many will not. Fewer of the retired workers resume formal education. Both groups may have to be offered a broad spectrum of services at places where they happen to be. And the services will have to be geared to the needs of the different age groups.

Programming for New Needs

The opportunity is educational, but education different from that of our highly structured pattern. More offerings will have to be activity-oriented, scattered widely throughout our community, including our campus (if we still have one), flexible to a high degree—ideally offerings in which an individual may come in and out as he pleases, devoid of the red tape of matriculation, class attendance reporting, grading, and the other attributes we associate with college.

Many colleges now experimenting with minicourses are discovering a large untapped population not previously served. Minicourses include traditional and nontraditional offerings, and include many subjects that a few years ago were not part of the regular curricula. Cake decorating, folk and square dancing, serving, personal charm, arts and crafts, flower arranging, and light exercises for women are appearing, made palatable to our critics by fees. These minicourses also enable colleges to explore new areas such as ecology, genetics, pollution, urban and suburban planning. The common characteristics of these minicourses are greater freedom for the student from red tape and enrollment lines, and absence of punitive regulations. Some offer credit, others do not. Some require fees, others do not. But, the great majority have appeal to people not currently served by the colleges.

During the past decade many services were established for disadvantaged and minority populations. Following this, nursery schools for our students' children have been opened, and efforts are pointed toward the large group of elderly persons concentrated in retirement colonies and nursing homes. All over the country ready-made communities are waiting for colleges to establish services for the elderly residents. Already models of successful patterns are available. Some colleges located near these developments are leading the way in establishing programs, cooperating with, as well as learning from such groups as the Institute of Lifetime Learning, an agency sponsored by the multimillion member American Association of Retired Persons. Programs for senior citizens may be established in the retirement colonies, colleges, or in places with specialized facilities; the *Saturday Review of Education* of February 1973 contains an excellent popular description of such programs in St. Petersburg College in Florida. The AACJC has established Project IMPAAC (Improving Manpower and Programs to Assist Aging Citizens) (Bulletin of Occupational Education, 8:1, November 1972.). Senior citizens are receiving gold passes that admit them to a wide range of activities sponsored by the colleges.

The Educational Role for Community Services

In many areas of community services, the colleges are cooperating with other agencies having the same general purpose. The college contribution in this cooperative endeavor is naturally in the educational aspect of community services. The educational aspects of our responsibilities in community services must be emphasized; for this is where we can contribute the most. Education is our mission, our reason for existence. Our regular collegiate program—traditional courses, grades, credentials, and degrees—must not be transformed, subordinated, or eliminated.

Our role in community services is adapting and expanding the services and activities now being performed. Community service is an adjunct to the regular programs, a means of offering our services to the community in its efforts at problem solving. We should take seriously the caveat contained in the Sixth Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Extension and Community Education that our function is to offer services to the community in its efforts at problem solving, but we should not undertake the role of problem solving. Responsibility for problem solving rests with the community leaders.

Neither should we assume that we are uniquely endowed to perform community services better than any other agency. Actually, if we but observe what is happening around us, we would have to agree with former President Merriman Cunniggin of the Danforth Foundation that "Nearly every self-respecting college or university these days is deeply involved in projects and programs related to its own environs—town, or city, or metropolitan area—and in some places the pendulum may have swung too far" (Danforth Foundation Annual Report, 1973). Our contributions in this area will not be demeaned if we acknowledge that many universities have a long history of community services—through extension, correspondence, radio, television, and field agents. In many towns and cities, they offer a wide range of noncredit seminars and classes as well as recreational, intellectual, musical, artistic, athletic activities. In some areas it would be extremely difficult for one of our colleges to compete with a nearby university in spectator athletics, for instance.

Private and public agencies are also engaged in community services. Many of them supplement our own; others attempt to substitute a new way of doing some of the things in which we are alleged to be failing, still others merely wish to offer alternatives. The various youth groups—Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, 4-H and Y Clubs, churches—have a variety of programs that are similar to those we offer. City and county recreational departments compete with us in a wide variety of activities. The police and fire departments carry on community services. All of these educational and noneducational public agencies have not had community services funds curtailed or their authority withdrawn. Chambers of commerce have information services, auto clubs, and insurance companies conduct safety programs, banks supply us with economic and demographic statistics we need for keeping our programs current, some profit-making institutions provide meeting places and exhibition space.

Probably, the most extravagant claim that can be made by some is that we must meet the community needs that are not served by any other agency. Do those making such a statement realize the enormity of the burden placed on these new colleges? There isn't any agency in the country that has been able to fulfill such a promise. There isn't a community college that has the resources to do so. I must assume that the statement is just hyperbole.

Community services require as much evaluation as academic, vocational, and counseling functions. Evaluations must be continuous in order to avoid the disappointment resulting from unfulfilled expectations that may lead to the abandonment of community services as a function. Absolutely essential is close scrutiny of projects that may arouse such deep feelings that they divide rather than unite the community. We must be alert to signs of disinterest, changes in moods, competition from other interests, saturation, or satiation. The pre-Civil

War Lyceum and the post-Civil War Chautauqua movements had a vogue for many years, performed a valuable educational function, and then declined. So will it be, quite properly, with many of our community services. Stagnation can result from failure to adjust to changing conditions or tastes by continuing declining programs in the hope that they can be revived to their former popularity.

Another danger is imitation of programs that are hailed as outstanding in the professional journals or by conference speakers. In community services as in any other area of education, there is no substitute for planning based on the particular needs of one's own community and the available resources. Models, examples, suggestions are valuable as guides, not as commandments. Usually articles or speakers present idealized versions of practices that require extensive modifications for a particular college.

Should this knowledge dampen enthusiasm for community services? On the contrary, it will improve community services by sharpening our definition, by offering opportunities to stretch resources and services in concert with other agencies; or if this is not feasible, direct our energies and resources to other needs. There is so much to be done in our communities that there is no want for projects and activities within our capabilities. It is an error to envy others or compete unnecessarily with any of them. More importantly, this knowledge will force us to develop a rationale of our proper place in this large area, to select projects carefully, to save ourselves the embarrassment of unfulfilled expectations based on ill-conceived projects—in short, to evaluate constantly.

Jurisdictional conflicts with competing agencies will arise as programs are developed. These are not new nor should it be surprising when they occur in such areas as recreation, health information, outreach programs, various environmental and ecological programs (save the beaches, the mountains, etc.), adult education. In fact the conflict among competing jurisdiction has led to legislation such as that "for the division of specified adult education functions between high school . . . and community college districts" and for the "establishment of area coordinating councils to review adult education" (Education Commission of the States, 1972).

More critical are divisions engendered when colleges invite speakers or engage in activities on which community consensus does not exist. There is hardly a college that has not been criticized for inviting a speaker whose views are different from those of the community leaders. Division within some communities occurred when colleges were closed for a day or more to permit students to participate in demonstrations and explore the issues involved in the Kent State tragedy, the Vietnam War. Another divisive activity was the drive to close colleges for a week or so before elections to enable students to take active part in the political campaigns. Many people are still dubious of those community services which are not conceived to be proper college functions.

There are limits to our involvement in community services. Efforts in community services, or in the whole process of education, are a small part of a complex political, social, economic milieu. How much influence, what effect we have is still the subject of debate. Jencks' *Inequality*, if taken literally, could be devastating to our ego. He, along with others, has pointed out that in many of our most pervasive problems—poverty, narcotics addiction, venereal disease, racism, war or threat to peace, environmental deterioration, population growth—education has extremely limited impact.

Unbounded enthusiasm can be a disservice to community services. The fewer claims made about an ability to resolve community problems, the more likely we are not to repeat the mistakes of the 1960s when we promised the millennium. Nor should we be so immodest as to believe that we have a panacea for the current ills of our society.

Summary

Outstanding community services programs can be developed by community colleges without implying that no other agency is providing them or that we have been given an exclusive franchise in this area. In this era, as in every era, the work to be done far exceeds the capacity of any agency or group. Our responsibility is to devise programs that fall within our jurisdiction. Our programs should add to the sum total of community services. If by adding a program some other agency is forced to close one of its programs, we perform a disservice to the community and we invite legislative action delimiting our areas of operation.

In developing our programs we pioneer in some fields, we cooperate with existing agencies in others, we desist from duplicating well-established programs. But whatever we do must be done in the context of our philosophy based on our charter or organization and within the personnel and financial resources at our disposal.

Short of a financial collapse of our economy state funding will continue, but it will have to be supplemented by local resources and by fees and charges for services and materials. We do well to recognize that in a recession community services will be one of the first services to be cut. Federal aid is a big question mark. If Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and other projects in the Education Amendments of 1972 are phased out by the federal administration, we will have to depend much more on state and local funds and considerably more on fees. The "peace benefits" on which we had placed so much hope seem remote. Fortunately, some states are increasing appropriations for community services.

A strong trend toward embracing continuing and adult education under community services will probably develop. The common elements among the three functions are becoming more important than the differences that formerly kept them apart. Diminishing emphasis on grades, credits, and credentials will accelerate the movement.

Yesterday we offered a limited number of services to those within commuting distance of our campus; today, not only are we expanding our services but we are taking them to the people. Underlying the expansion of services is our sensitivity to the changing demographic, sociological, and economic conditions affecting our community and our acceptance of greater responsibility for cooperating with our community in its efforts to resolve problems created by these changes. In moving outward from the campus we are opening our college doors to greater numbers within the community. Though its function, organization, and financial support are in a state of flux, community services has an assured place in our colleges. The issue is not whether we should include it, but in what form shall we shape it so it can contribute most effectively to the mission of the community college.

References

Higher Education in the States. (October, 1972). 3:200, published by the Education Commission of the States, .

"The President's Review: The Improvement of College Teaching." (1973). In *The Danforth Foundation Annual Report 1971–1972*, St. Louis, Missouri, p.14.

Chapter 10

STUDENT ACTIVISM

Introduction

Students, because of their large numbers; because of their alertness to the world; because of their desire to participate in the struggles on campus, in the community, and in the world; and because of their activism, are attracting unusual, mostly unfavorable, attention. Junior college students recently have been more active outside the classroom than at any time since the 1930s. This activism revolves around the uneasiness created by the Vietnam War, the draft, racial disturbances and deterioration of our cities, dissatisfaction with status quo, the feeling of anomie in large institutions, and moral indignation at injustices—national and international. Some attribute part of the uneasiness to those students who are finding it difficult to look at the world today and not to feel guilty at being a comfortable middle-class person.

Some also talk of a generation gap, the distrust of the young for anyone over thirty. The generation gap talk may be related to the impatience of youth with the long period of initiation they must undergo before being permitted to assume responsibility for their own activities and for the conduct of business, civic, college, and political affairs. They may also be frustrated because, while "consciously rejecting and refusing the old world, they are finding it difficult to invent the new" (Dolci, 1968).

Lombardi, John. *Student Activism in Junior Colleges: An Administrator's Views*, Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges and American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Monograph Series, 1969.

Theories on the causes of student activism are as numerous as those applied to the origins of World War I. S. L. Halleck, professor of psychiatry at the University of Wisconsin, has cataloged fifteen hypotheses with the warning: No hypothesis thus far advanced can be considered a sufficient explanation of student unrest. At best, each is only a partial explanation which sheds only a small light upon a highly complex phenomenon (Halleck, 1968).

Definition of Activism

Ordinarily activism is defined as those campus activities in which students are in conflict with administrators or, less frequently, with instructors or other students. Student activism sometimes extends into the community from the campus and, at other times, starts in the community and is brought to the campus.

Student activism, however, includes more than conflict. It includes activities in which students become members of establishment organizations such as Young Republicans and Young Democrats, organize tutorial groups to help pupils in low socioeconomic areas and in migrant farm workers' camps, volunteer to participate in civil rights causes, enlist in the Peace Crops, solicit books for colleges in underdeveloped countries, or form international clubs to help foreign students make a more satisfactory adjustment to American life. These positive aspects may also include student concern with curriculum, with socially acceptable action coming out of open-forum debate, and with teaching excellence.

But these more temperate activities are not the ingredients of publicity and notoriety. Nor are they the elements that bring about rapid changes in the organization or in the customs, traditions, and rules of campus life. In this discussion of student activism, emphasis will be on those activities that engender conflict rather than on those that form the normal program of student life. Emphasis will be placed on the movements variously called student revolt, black revolt, student left, New Left, or student power.

Free Speech Movement

Any discussion of extreme student activism must begin with the Free Speech Movement (F.S.M.) at Berkeley, which is to student activism what the fall of the Bastille was to the French Revolution. It was a student rebellion that has few parallels in our educational history. It attracted large numbers of students, received unusual support from the faculty, and, for a time, brought educational activities to a halt. Although similar, but not so extensive and dramatic outbursts occurred at other colleges about the same time, F.S.M. has become the model and the measure of all subsequent student outbursts.

The authors of *It's happening* extolled F.S.M. in these words:

> If there is any one moment that is the glory of the New Left, it must be that night in December 1964, when policemen dragged several hundred live bodies from the Berkeley campus. . . . For many the Sproul Hall sit-in is synonymous with "The Day"—the day radical came of age, brought a university to a virtual chaotic standstill. . . . To students and former students across the country, the Free Speech Movement lived in the very image of the young generation's aspirations (Simmons and Winograd, 1966).

The community and the university, however, have taken a different view. They were shaken so severely that neither has fully recovered. The Reagan attack on President Clark Kerr and the university can be considered in part as a fulfillment of campaign promises to his extreme conservative followers. Even some of the original supporters of F.S.M. recoiled when it seemed to get out of hand. They joined the conservatives in applauding the judges who imposed stiff sentences on the students involved.

Between these extremes are those who look on this activism as an encouraging sign for tomorrow's leaders. Students, this group believes, should be concerned about the great social and political issues of the day, rather than spilling their pent-up energy on panty raids and resort-area brawls (*College and University Business*, 1965). But some junior college educators, who "would feel that there was something wrong with our educational systems were (student activism) not present," add: "this observation, of course, does not apply to the potentialities for disruption of the educational process which exist when some of the (extreme) militancies . . . are present" (*Peralta Colleges Bulletin*, 1968).

Following F.S.M., many other college campuses throughout the country came under attack by student activists. Exceeding most attacks in intensity of violence and in extent of disruptive effect on the operations of the university was the "Columbia Crisis" of April 23–30, 1968, which involved Black Power and Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.) activists. The "Columbia Crisis" has joined F.S.M. as a landmark in the history of student activism.

Moderate Activism in Junior Colleges

Junior colleges have also been affected by student activism but nothing that has happened is comparable to the Berkeley or the Columbia crises. In comparison with the turmoil on four-year campuses, junior colleges have been calm, even though, to the presidents of colleges presently confronting activist students, this can be of little comfort. Therefore, in describing student activism in the junior colleges, it is important to emphasize the lesser intensity of the activism and its accompanying violence.

Significant also is the absence of serious political concern of the kind expressed by public officials and citizens over the activism present in the colleges and universities. California Governor Reagan's "sick campus community" letter was directed to state college trustees and University of California regents with no reference to junior colleges (*Los Angeles Times*, June 12, 1968). Likewise, in his position paper on education, the governor's critical remarks were directed at the state colleges and university faculty members and administrators who "have lacked courage to expel students whose real goals are patently not academic and to dismiss instructors who betray their academic calling through disruptive and violent activities on the campus" (*Los Angeles Times*, July 21, 1968).

As in four-year colleges and universities, the number of activists is a tiny fraction of the total student body. Even among Black Power advocates, the number of blacks is small but the 2 percent of the students who are the activists—black, white, brown—make up in organization, aggressiveness, strategy, outside resources, idealism, and willingness what they lack in numbers.

The statement about the moderate character of activism on junior college campuses does not imply that conditions are ideal. Obviously, students on many campuses do not consider them so; but demands for admission of more students from minority groups—a favorite activist topic—cannot be too convincing on campuses with large enrollments of such students. In New York City, blacks and Puerto Ricans comprise 25 percent of the students in public two-year colleges compared with 8 percent in public four-year colleges (Fulton, 1968). In some junior colleges the proportion of blacks exceeds 25 percent; in several it is almost 75 percent. In one college, one-third of the students have Spanish surnames (Los Angeles City Schools, 1967). Also, junior colleges not only admit large numbers of minority students but they offer programs to help them remedy cultural, economic, and educational deficiencies. Nor can demands for scholarships create much activity since junior colleges have low or no tuition; living and other expenses are lower than on four-year campuses; and most junior college students work part time. An exception to the above statement needs to be mentioned. Junior college teaching and administrative staffs do not have an adequate representation of minority groups.

Two other possible contributing factors to the milder activism are:

1. The counseling and guidance services, which help the freshman adjust to the new environment of the college and the sophomore to prepare for a job or transfer to a four-year college or university. Throughout his stay in college, the student not only has these services at his call but is also importuned to avail himself of them. The student is made to feel he has identity.
2. The strong student personnel administrative divisions that insure that someone at a high level is responsible and is expected to act when crises involving students occur. Student personnel officers on junior college campuses have status comparable to that of other administrative officers and have not been hampered in the exercise of their responsibilities by faculty senates. Junior college senates, which have come into existence only recently, have not yet acquired the power and prestige of the four-year college and university senates.

Junior college students may also be less active not only because they are less mature than four-year college students but also because they are more dependent on their own resources. They do not have the freedom made possible by financial support from home. Since they must work to continue in college, they cannot demonstrate for days on end; they can only participate in demonstrations for an hour or two on any one day because the job awaits them. Also, they either live at home or in off-campus dwellings. Many of those who ordinarily would become the leaders of activist groups get campus jobs or grants to act as tutors, student counselors, or teaching aides. As they accept such assignments, they temper their militant behavior.

Another reason for the milder aspect of activism on junior college campuses is the absence of professionals, who often may be planted on four-year and university campuses. Leaders of revolutionary organizations have concentrated their efforts and financial resources on the larger arena where disruptive activities have greater potential for revolution. Bringing prominent colleges and universities to a halt attracts more attention than similar activity on junior college campuses.

Still another reason for the milder form of activism may be inferred from studies that reveal that patterns of activism are related to kind and size of institution. Large public and private universities were found "relatively permissive in regard to student freedom to discuss controversial topics, invite off-campus speakers, demonstrate actively, and engage in civil rights activity." At the teachers' colleges, "there was less than average freedom" in these areas

(Peterson, 1968). Junior colleges were not included in either study but, if we assume a positive relationship between activism and aptitude, intellectual interest, and venturesomeness, the description of junior college students by Cross will permit placing junior colleges alongside teachers' colleges. In Cross's description, junior college students (1) "achieve lower mean scores on academic ability"; (2) "tend to have lower socioeconomic status than comparable selected samples of four-year college and university students"; (3) "do not seek an intellectual atmosphere, nor do they find it"; (4) "are more likely to be cautious and controlled, less likely to be venturesome and flexible in their thinking" (Cross, 1968).

The Burton Clark-Martin Trow typology also indicates that "vocationalists" are more likely to accept institutional values and "consistently score relatively low on the College Student Questionnaire's (CSQ) measures of cultural sophistication, social conscience, and liberalism" (Peterson, 1968).

Other studies indicate that dormitory students are more inclined to be activists than commuting students (Lipset, 1968). Whites have attacked dormitory living rules, while blacks have attacked alleged discriminatory practices.

Another clue to the incidence of activism on junior college campuses is size. Peterson claims that "the relative prevalence of organized student activism concerning off-campus political and social issues in the large institutions is probably less the result of multiversity-induced alienation than it is a reflection of the gross numbers of diverse individuals brought together at one time and place" (Peterson, 1968). In a large institution almost any issue will attract some students. Since junior colleges are still comparatively small, they do not offer the opportunity for this type of activism. Even among junior college campuses, however, a positive relation exists between size and extent of activism.

Student Activist Groupings

Although activism takes many forms, it usually falls into four broad classifications, according to the groups of students concerned. These groupings are not mutually exclusive. Interaction and cooperation among some of them are effected, although the combinations change, depending on the issue or the form of protest. Within the groups, splinter movements exist or develop because of disagreements over methods and goals. The four groups are: (1) New Left, dominated by Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.), to which most of the white student leftists belong; (2) minority groups—blacks in all sections of the country, Mexican-Americans in the West and Southwest, and Puerto Ricans in the East; (3) rightists; and (4) student body officers. American Indians are sometimes classified as an activist group, but up to now they have not been a significant factor in student activism.

The first two groups comprise the New Left, a term for many liberal and radical groups with different goals, but loosely associated "on the basis of a socialist political ideology, a faith in participatory democracy and a commitment to direct social action" (Peterson, 1968).

The aims of the various groups may be summed up in the statement by Edward Schwartz, then vice-president of N.S.A., that the "Student Power movement is designed to gain for students their full rights to democratically control their nonacademic lives and participate to the fullest in the administrative and decision-making process of the college" (Chronicle, 1967).

Characteristic of student activism are the racial, ethnic, and religious overtones among the various groups. Blacks, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans organized themselves by design on identifiable racial and ethnic traits. Their reason for being depends upon this classification. The blacks went a step beyond by excluding other racial or ethnic groups from membership in their organizations. This separatist principle is not part of the program of the other minority groups.

N.S.A. is an inclusive organization embracing student leaders from all racial, ethnic, and religious groups. S.D.S., not by choice, has become a white organization with a large Jewish membership and leadership (Hertzberg, 1968; Trombley, 1968). The rightist groups are dominated by white Protestants and Catholics, with the former in the ascendancy.

This condition among student activist groups parallels many of the divisions in society. As in society, instead of a horizontal amalgamation or melding of the various strains in the student bodies, a series of vertical groupings seems to have formed in our colleges. The melting-pot notion, as Glazer and Moynihan (1964) concluded about New York City, as "an idea close to the heart of the American self-image," has not yet happened in the colleges.

Most students in American colleges are not associated with activist groups. Although some may be sympathetic with one or more of the activists' goals and may occasionally participate in demonstrations, and although recruits from among them make it possible to start some form of agitation on almost any issue, most students are probably not interested in activism.

The activists, it must be repeated, represent only a small number of the student bodies in the colleges. Few white, black, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Catholic, Jewish, or Protestant students are affiliated with any student-activist groups. What was said about the membership composition of the various groups related only to that fact. From the analysis of racial or ethnic or religious affiliations, no conclusion can be reached regarding the views or attitude of an individual student toward a particular program of an activist group. Many students of all classifications are either apathetic toward or mildly sympathetic with the aims of the militants. Accordingly, the potentially stabilizing force of peer disapproval does not operate to effect peace on the campus.

Breakdown of Student Government

Organizationally, student body government has relied too much on the model of political government. A substitute for elective office has not been found, nor has a method of representing a wider spectrum of the student body. In the student body councils, restrictions are so numerous that a large part of the time is devoted to forms and procedures. Robert's Rules of Order and the parliamentarians often stultify deliberations. "Preoccupation with method, technique, and procedure gains a subtle dominance over the whole process of goal seeking. *How* it is done becomes more important than *whether* it is done" (Gardner, 1963). In print, the issues the student councils discuss seem trivial and petty. An alumni report on the Columbia situation also recommended "a more effective body for self-government than the present University Student Council" (Walsh, 1968).

Inertia affects every institution. In student government, custom determines the names of the student offices, the activities and organizations to be sponsored, and the amount of money to be allocated as rigidly as the mores and taboos of primitive societies. Moreover, administrators place obstacles in the way of change, especially if they are not in sympathy with the student proposals. They do not want students to rock the boat or to offend this or that community group with radical ideas. It is easier for them to approve or disapprove a familiar program than to try to determine whether or not a new program is proper for the college. Finally, tenure is too short for student officers to accomplish much. Almost as soon as they take office, their terms end.

A good deal of student body government has a touch of Alice in Wonderland. For example, although the bookstore is a student activity, the students have little or no participation in formulating policy, in selecting employees, or in determining items to be sold. Only occasionally are students able to force administrators to lower prices on store items, especially on used texts. The only benefit students get from this activity is the profit. The make-believe nature of much student body government relates to other areas as well. Students provide the funds for the newspaper, but rarely have a say in the selection of the editor and the staff. The case is similar in the control of the student activities office where student body workers are employed. The intercollegiate athletics program usually has the largest appropriation of any activity, but students have little representation on athletic committees and virtually no voice in the selection of coaches.

Student budget-making is often just an exercise. Since such a large proportion of the budget is earmarked for salaries and for continuing activities in athletics, journalism, theater arts, and music, little initiative is left to the students. Commitments by previous officers and administrators are made to seem mandatory. In California, although the student body fee is voluntary, some college administrators make it seem mandatory by requiring students during the registration procedure to pass though a station where membership cards are sold. Where students have challenged this subterfuge, they have forced the administration to make membership voluntary. In these colleges, memberships have declined, as have the activities supported by these funds. To counteract this trend, student body officers, through their regional and state associations, have sponsored legislation for compulsory student body fees, another illustration of a minority attempting to impose its will on the majority! And administrators through their association are supporting the majority!

The student officers' unrealistic expectations relate to the nature of the institution and the responsibilities of the college administration as imposed by law, and by state and local regulations. A college is not a political institution; a student is not a citizen in the political sense. The student's status is more akin to that of a client. Although student government is not yet a right, a body of legal precedents is developing, modifying the principle that self-government is a privilege granted by law or by the college.

Considerable progress has been made in modifying the restrictive relationships that flow from the doctrine of *in loco parentis*. Although California junior colleges are still classified as secondary institutions, in practice they are treated as institutions of higher education. Administrators and faculty generally treat students as adults, not as minors.

Participation in College Government

Student activism has had two main objectives: freedom from restrictive rules and participation in the governance of the college. Considerable advance has been made in the first objective, very little on the second. Junior college students have been given places on college committees, and presidents' round tables and student opinion centers have been established; but little student participation in the governance of the colleges has resulted. Some criticize administrators and faculty for resistance or "cautious acceptance." Tokenism has characterized these efforts (Simonsen, 1968).

Even with the best will, not much can be done to change the relationship of junior college students to the governance of the college. Too few of them are interested. A student editor, Jose Suarez, analyzed the difficulty when he observed:

> Junior college isn't a place where things get done on a large scale. It's hard to get parking lots paved; to get better cafeteria service; to give away 5,000 school papers to a 20,000 member student body. . . . When the jukebox was removed from the Breakaway, there were many cries of 'Et tu, Brute?' but they soon died after the realization by these students that they would have to go through a long and involved process to get it back. . . . But let someone start an argument on black power in the Breakaway, or start a flagpole rally which disrupts classes, distribute literature illegally, or have an outside speaker on campus illegally, then everyone wants to get into the act (Suarez, 1967).

Mr. Suarez was unintentionally telling the administrators of the college that they could extend more opportunities for "participatory democracy" without danger of getting too many students to accept! He summarized the difficulties involved in student participation as student apathy and administrative red tape.

Notwithstanding these obstacles, some junior college administrators believe "a vast reservoir of [student] energy and talent" will continue to go to waste unless students are "taken into the inner sanctum of the management of the college." The administrators' reluctance is difficult to understand because it "can be done without turning the institution over to the students who, in a two-year college, can accurately be described as transients (Collins, 1968).

The student editor of the *Pierce College Roundup* also believed in involvement as a way of giving students "a more effective voice in the direct governing of every aspect of campus life." The remedy was an adaption of the council of students and faculty in operation at Pitzer College in the Claremont colleges cluster. Again, administrators are assured "this move toward more student freedom doesn't mean the students will be running the college. It merely suggests the power of organized support for a need; and rarely does a college president veto a recommendation which has . . . strong support from student and faculty members" (Tozzi, 1967).

The vagueness of the proposals for student participation in the governance of the college is a measure of the difficulty of trying to create a situation that may have little meaning. Rather than concentrating on devising ways for students to participate in the governance of the college, administrators should place priority on giving students more freedom to conduct their own activities.

Efforts to reshape student government so that students really control their activities will be more productive and will be more relevant to them. Students will not be self-governing if members of the board of trustees or administrators attempt to force students to require loyalty oaths or a fixed number of signatures for a petition, or certain scholarship standards for office holding. Mickey Mouse is still Mickey Mouse whether he is on the screen, in a comic book, or walking around at Disneyland.

Student Rights Defined

For the second time in a short period, the academic community has been forced to reexamine many of its practices, regulations, and customs. First was the reexamination of the curriculum and educational programs that followed the launching of Sputnik by the Russians. No sooner had administrators made their adjustments to this clamor for educational reform than they were struck by the more disturbing revolt of students. Both movements resulted in action of various kinds by educational associations, legislatures, commissions, and individuals. In addition to campus, legislative, and court actions, student activism has resulted in several statements on student rights, three of which have special significance in understanding the impact of student activism on administrative policy.

The 1966 American Association of University Professors' "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" includes two sections on students, a paragraph in the preface, and a section, "On Student Status," at the end. In the same year the American Council on Education prepared a "Statement on Confidentiality of Student Records." The most inclusive of these documents was the "Joint Statement of Rights and Freedoms of Students."

Significance of Documents

These documents represent an historical record of one of the most important eras in the life of American colleges and universities. In these documents, college and university administrators (and students) have restated and redefined the philosophy and purpose of higher education. In them will be found the accommodations to student criticisms of campus practices and the rationales governing the relationships between students and the faculty, administration, and community. Gathered together are the most reasonable of the proposals for reform instituted in some colleges or recommended for adoption by scholars and observers. These documents contain suggestions on the "acceptable" practices and procedures that will conform to the new freedoms won by students through conflict, persuasion, court action, and legislation.

The documents will not reverse the roles of administrator and student; they are not revolutionary; nor will they satisfy the New Leftists or S.D.S. Enthusiasm for these suggestions will be tempered by the realization that they need implementation on the campus. By themselves the documents will not restore harmony on campus. They require acceptance by administrators; they need to be converted into campus rules supplanting those that contributed to student unrest. They require a willingness "to accord students, as members of the academic community, an appropriate share in the determination of institutional policies in respect to both the instructional program and its social framework" (Board of Directors, 1968).

These documents represent a triumph for the students of this generation, which "has unexpectedly . . . become the leaven in the lump, the party of hope, the spirit of change, the conscience of our time. For the first time in many years, one can see what it means to persist in that healthy condition of society that makes alternatives seem possible, that makes human faith possible again" (Kazin, 1968).

Not all colleges and university administrators will subscribe to Kazin's eulogy of students. Neither will all of them accept, immediately, all of the suggestions. For some, the proposals are too radical. Many will need time to adjust to the new order, but retreat to the *status quo ante* student activism is not possible. As the present administrators are replaced by a new generation, accommodation to the new order will be made and, after consolidation of gains, a new generation of students will seek new freedom.

Procedural Due Process

All educators have been involved on campus in the matter of regulating student conduct in activities outside the classroom. Whether these are totally non-academic or non-instructional is not altogether clear, but in general they include such activities as free speech, freedom of assembly, freedom to demonstrate, civil disobedience as a means of expressing dissatisfaction with a law or regulation, and similar matters. These form the principal substance of student activism. Here, too, much progress has been made by the activists, but here also is where so much conflict between the rights of students and the responsibilities of administrators arises and where so many court cases have originated.

The courts have exerted influence in many areas of student life. Through decisions on student cases, the doctrine of *in loco parentis* has disappeared in most junior colleges. Additionally, the insistence of courts on some form of due process in the disciplining of students is broadening the rights of students to an education in the public colleges. No longer is a college education considered a privilege, nor may a college arbitrarily deprive a student of his constitutional rights by statements in the catalog or by forcing the student to sign a statement as a condition of admission—a modern form of "yellow dog" contract (*College and University Business*, 1967; Horle and Thompson, 1968).

In general, the federal and state courts have modified or restricted the authority of the college administrators by ruling that "colleges are subject to the Constitution as are other institutions." In a New York case involving a student barred from taking regents examinations without a hearing because he had cheated on an examination, the court ruled that he had been deprived of rights under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution by not being given a hearing with the aid of counsel (*College and University Business*, 1967).

In Alabama, a federal judge, in ordering a suspended student editor reinstated, declared: "A state cannot force a college student to forfeit his constitutionally protected right of freedom of expression as condition of his attending a state-supported institution." In a South Carolina case, a federal judge, ruling that a college cannot put "a prior restraint on the right of freedom of speech and the right to assemble," ordered the suspension lifted against three students for leading demonstrations (*Phi Delta Kappan*, 1967).

The California Supreme Court in *Goldberg vs. Regents of the University of California* checked this trend and restored the balance between student rights and college authority. The case, which has become a landmark in this new field of law, attracted attention because it involved F.S.M. students who deliberately set out to defy university regulations by advocating "an open, fierce and thorough-going rebellion on this campus, to organize and split this campus wide open!" A sit-in in the administration building ended when the governor ordered the forcible removal of the participants. In protest at the arrest of students and nonstudents, a new F.S.M., Filthy Speech Movement, was organized and its members began using obscenities in gatherings on the campus. The university dismissed one student and suspended three. After a series of hearings and injunction proceedings, the students appealed to the Supreme Court, which held that:

> . . . in this case, the university's disciplinary action was a proper exercise of its inherent general powers to maintain order on the campus and to exclude therefrom those who are detrimental to its well-being (Blackwell, 1967).

Also significant was the Court's reasoning that:

> Broadly stated, the function of the university is to impart learning and to advance the boundaries of knowledge. This carries with it the administrative responsibility to control and regulate that conduct and behavior of the students which tends to impede, obstruct or threaten the achievements of its educational goals. Thus, the university has the power to formulate and enforce rules of student conduct that are appropriate and necessary to the maintenance of order and propriety, considering the accepted norms of social behavior of the community, where such rules are reasonably necessary to further the university's educational goals.

The decision recognized a distinction between the academic community and the broader social community, a distinction that, by reaffirming the special position of the academic community in society, stemmed the trend toward making the academic community subject to the same rules and regulations as the broader community. The Court observed:

> Historically, the academic community has been unique in having its own standards, rewards and punishments. Its members have been allowed to go about their business of teaching and learning largely free of outside interference. To compel such a community to recognize and enforce precisely the same standards and penalties that prevail in the broader social community would serve neither the special needs and interests of the educational institutions nor the ultimate advantages that society derives therefrom. Thus, in an academic community, greater freedoms and greater restrictions may prevail than in society at large, and the subtle fixing of these limits should, in a large measure, be left to the educational institution itself (Kinnison, 1968).

Although this decision, as was pointed out, redressed the balance between the rights of students and the responsibility of administrators to maintain order, it would be a mistake to think it restored the former unlimited authority of administrators over students. Administrators were given a breathing spell by the Goldberg decision, not a license to return to the preactivist era.

The Goldberg case must be evaluated in relation to the other cases, especially to the *Dixon v. Alabama* case. The procedure outlined by the judge in that case is worth reproducing for its clarity, succinctness, and appropriateness. The judge wrote:

> The student should be given the names of witnesses against him and an oral or written report on the facts to which each witness testified. He should be given the opportunity to present to the Board, or at least to an administrative official of the college, his own defence against the charges and to produce either oral or written affidavits of witnesses in his own behalf" (State Board of Education, 1967).

The dictum has become a guide for administrators in reshaping their disciplinary procedures. It was not supplanted by the Goldberg case. In fact, Associate Justice Taylor ruled that "the hearing provided to plaintiffs more than adequately complied with the Dixon standards" (57 Cal. Retr, 474). Procedural due process need not be as rigid or as strict as legal due process in criminal cases, but the rights of students in the academic community must not be infringed or violated. The bounds or limits of this new due process doctrine are not clear, although the California Goldberg case did set a general pattern.

Junior college administrators, like university administrators, are reexamining their student conduct regulations and their procedures for disciplining students accused of violating them. Junior college administrators had various codes before F.S.M. and the Goldberg case, but the procedural due process limits were not defined or the codes were ineffective, administratively dominated, or based on a strict *in loco parentis* interpretation more applicable to elementary and secondary pupils than to junior college students. Very few codes met the standards of the courts. Students objected, and still do, to being presented with administratively drafted rules and disciplinary committees dominated by administrators and faculty (*Los Angeles Collegian*, May 23, 1968).

Sometimes a junior college administrator is forced to defend in court his disciplinary action. This was the case when Los Angeles Valley College students challenged their suspension following a disruptive demonstration against military recruiters. The college lost the case because it failed to provide adequate procedural due process. Subsequently the dean of students took steps to redefine the standards of student conduct and to seek the cooperation of the other deans of the Los Angeles college system in drafting standards conforming to the new order. This task involved a study of practices in other colleges, of California law, and of appropriate court cases and practices in California and other states. The "Student Conduct Standards Spelled Out," by the University of California, has been influential.

This egalitarian development on American college campuses mirrors a similar development in society, especially its emphasis on the many manifestations of individual rights.

Assessment

The aim of student activism or the "student power" movement is designed to "gain students their full rights to democratically control their nonacademic lives and participate to the fullest in the administrative and educational decision-making process of the college" (National Students Association, 1967). The activism of the 1960s has brought about a remarkable change in the position of students on junior college campuses. Much of the change was accomplished by direct action of students, some as a result of changes in the mores of our society, and some by the changed attitude of college and university administrators. The courts and, to a lesser degree, the state legislatures contributed to the gains made by students. The regressive legislation and restraining court decisions, while serious, have not adversely affected the students' freedom; in most instances, they have attempted to curb only the excesses of student activists.

Effect on Curriculum and Instruction

In many areas, the effects of student activism on the curriculum are of a transitory nature. Experimental colleges conducted by students are usually short-lived, as were teach-ins, and, except for some odd titles and course contents, are not significant. Their contribution to reform has been to point up the dissatisfaction of some students and faculty with the traditional curriculum and instructional methods. Changes that appear to be more permanent include courses and curriculums on Afro-American history, culture, literature, art, music, and language. Agitation for these changes is not limited to college curriculums; it affects all areas of society. It is too early to judge whether or not the separatist trend toward having black instructors teach black courses to black students will become more established practice on junior college campuses. Some administrators are making concessions in this direction; but it is probable that blacks may, after gaining recognition of their demands, recede from their extreme position. The reorientation of the curriculum toward a world view rather than the exclusive Western view may be a permanent contribution of student activism to the junior colleges.

Very little has been accomplished in changing the quality of instruction. Occasional flurries appear on campuses for evaluation of instructors. Student evaluations are made, sometimes published, but more often given to the instructor for whatever use he wishes to make of them. An exception is "Insight: A View of the Faculty Through the Eyes of Their Students ("Insight . . . ," 1968)," which contains the results of a student-faculty evaluation project at Palomar

College. Included in the widely distributed booklet are some frank, critical student evaluations of faculty. The revival of student evaluations is a tribute to the persuasiveness of the students, since the Palomar faculty, like most faculties, "took great exception to the practice" when it was required by the governing board and did not follow its mandate.

Even when published, these student evaluations have little effect on the instructors' teaching. Follow-ups to determine their effectiveness on instruction are seldom made. Administrative evaluations have been no more effective. Faculty in junior colleges believe classroom evaluations by administrators are a carry-over from the high school, although they do not make the parallel observation that student evaluations are a university practice (*The Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 2, 1968; Cohen and Brawer, 1969).

Charters of Liberty

The three statements on governance and student rights are documents of far-reaching importance because in them are incorporated the essence of the rights for which students have agitated. Long after student activism becomes history, these documents will influence administrators in defining the rights and responsibilities of students. These documents, together with court cases, form a *magna carta* for students.

The documents, however, are not self-implementing. They require transformation into the rules and regulations of the colleges. Translating the various sections will require considerable educational statesmanship even among those already committed to the principles enunciated in the documents. For those educators who subscribe to the letter but not to the spirit of the principle, the general and vague nature of some sections offers them opportunities to resist granting real freedom and self-government to the students.

Many more court cases will arise because students are insisting on rights formerly unheard of. These will help set the guidelines and the limits, and the particular responsibilities and authority of each group.

Student Emancipation

Students are much freer on campus and their off-campus activities are of practically no official concern to college authorities. Some freedoms, such as smoking and card playing, antedated the activist movement, being won by returning veterans of World War II in 1947 and 1948. Prohibitions on junior college campuses on these activities were vestiges of the former status of the junior college as part of the high school.

Dress regulations were usually less strict in junior colleges than in high schools, but more stringent than on university campuses. During this period, however, they have become more liberal, until today on many campuses almost any kind of dress is permitted. Shorts, slacks, beards, and long hair for men and shorts, sandals, miniskirts, and stretch pants for women are common attire. A few colleges attempt to curb students who go barefooted. Some faculty, especially those in occupational areas, are more conservative than administrators and require students to conform to rules they claim are current in the business and industry groups they serve.

Restrictions on student newspapers and publications are loosening (*College and University Business*, 1967). Few have gone as far as Peralta (California) Junior College District's policy of no censorship of any student publication in any of its colleges or the policy of Pine Manor Junior College (Massachusetts), which permits students to publish a newspaper *Salmangundi* without faculty supervision or censorship. Only a few retain the tight supervision so common before the 1960s. Between the two extremes, various accommodations to freedom of the press have been made. Four-letter words, nudes, and phallic symbols appear in many campus publications. Captions on articles that were unthinkable a decade ago are commonplace today. "Is the preservation of virginity more important than the preservation of life itself?" causes hardly an eyebrow to flutter (Herron, 1968).

Legal problems still arise for administrators who want to give students freedom from faculty or administrative supervision. The printer of El Camino's (California) *Life Warrior* refused to include a nude picture of a small child unless he received from the college a "hold harmless" waiver of responsibility and liability. He contended that the child could sue the printer many years later for causing him pain and anguish because of the picture. College governing boards in most states cannot absolve themselves of liability for acts committed by students engaged in college activities. Before complete freedom can be granted, some way must be found to free colleges from libel and damage suits resulting from student actions.

Free speech in its various forms appears to be less of a problem on junior college campuses. Students are given more freedom to discuss subjects of their own choosing, either indoors or outdoors. Off-campus speakers of nearly all persuasions from the extreme right to the extreme left are appearing with increasing frequency. Boards of trustees are less uneasy about the ideology of speakers and more willing to support administrators' judgment in this area. Some boards have endorsed the A.A.U.P. statement or have adopted similar ones subscribing to the principle of free speech" (Board of Trustees, 1967). Today, conservatives are complaining that colleges have "a steady stream of left-wing speakers (*Argus*, 1968)." Administrators in many colleges are still reluctant or unwilling to approve Communist or extreme leftist speakers. A few apply the same restrictive policy to extreme rightist speakers. Some are also uneasy about permitting Black Power advocates, because of community objections to speakers like Dick Gregory or Black Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver, who antagonize people in such greatly different communities as those served by Los Angeles Harbor College and Colby Junior College, a woman's private junior college in New London, New Hampshire. Black Power militants are more feared than Communists.

To keep some control over the selection of speakers, administrators are appointing student-faculty-administration committees to formulate speakers' policies. In California these policies, which are influenced by the university's policy, include statements on the relevance of the speaker's topic and on his willingness to answer "unselected questions from the floor which are related to his address" (Regulations, UCLA, 1966). On-campus approval is usually required from a dean or the president.

College administrators, on their own and at the urging of students, faculty, and community leaders, are reexamining the position of the student in the governance of the college, with special attention to his rights, privileges, and responsibilities. Through student-faculty-administration committees, they are preparing and adopting standards for student conduct. Within limits they are permitting students to determine the kind of government they desire.

These may not seem like significant concessions to students, but in comparison with conditions before the advent of activism, they are far-reaching. Just to admit that students have rights, that speakers' policies should be formulated with students, that procedures for disciplinary actions must be written, that curriculum changes are needed, that instruction needs to be improved, that more black and brown instructors and administrators should be appointed constitutes a tremendous victory.

References

Argus. (April 4, 1968). Fremont, California.

Blackwell, T. E. (1967). Court affirms university's right to discipline students. *College and University Business, 43*, 15.

Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges. (July 1968). "Student Unrest," Statement.

Board of Trustees. (August 9, 1967). San Mateo Junior College District, "Board of Trustees' Policy on the Study of Controversial Issues." Policies and Procedures Section 6.35, (California).

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (1967). NSA cuts CIA ties. Finds its members loyal, *1*, 8–10. (Excerpts from an article "NSA-CIA" in March 1966 issue of *Ramparts* are reproduced on page 8.)

The Chronicle of Higher Education. (August 23, 1967). 1:7.

Collins, J., president, Moorpark College, Ventura, California, quoted in Simonsen, op cit, p. 28.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1969) *Measuring faculty performance*. Washington, DC: American Association of Junior Colleges.

College and University Business. (1965). *37*, 9.

College and University Business. (1967). *43*, 19.

Cross, P. K. (1968). *The junior college student: A research description*. Princeton, NJ: Education Testing Service.

Dolci, D. (July 6, 1968). Mafia-client politics. *Saturday Review, 51*, 51.

Fulton, J. G. (July 17, 1968). "Community Colleges Have an Important Role in National Education." *Congressional Record*, p. 3.

Gardner, J. (1963). *Self-renewal*. New York: Harper & Row.

Glazer, N., & Moynihan, D. P. (1964). *Beyond the melting pot*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge, M.I.T., and Harvard University Press.

Halleck, S. L. (March 4, 1968). "Stress and student unrest." Address presented to concurrent General Session I [illegible] the 23rd National Conference on Higher Education. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education. Mimeo.

Herron, O. R. (Spring, 1968). *Life Warrior, 6*, 10. (El Camino College, California).

Hertzberg, A. (July 6, 1968). "The Affluent Surface." *Saturday Review*, 51:25.

"How to Organize Control of Your Student Publications." (October, 1967). *College and University Business, 43*, p.4–10.

"Insight: A View of the Faculty Through the Eyes of Their Students." (Spring, 1968). San Marcos, CA: Palomar College Press.

Kazin, A. (August 1, 1968). The young: The party of hope. *Vogue, 152*, 123.

Kinnison, W. A. (June, 1968). "New Power Relationships on the Campus." *Journal of Higher Education, 39*, 312–313.

Lipset, S. M. (1968). Students and politics in comparative perspective. *Daedalus, 97*, 3–5.

Los Angeles City Schools. (May 1968). "Minority Students in California", *The California Professor*. Published by the California Teachers Association, 2:2.

Los Angeles City Schools. (May 23, 1968). *Racial and Ethnic Survey*, Fall 1967, p.89–90. *Los Angeles Collegian.*

Los Angeles Times. (June 12, 1968). Part 1.

Los Angeles Times. (July 21, 1968). Section B.

National Students Association, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 1:7, August 23, 1967.

Peralta College Bulletin. (January 12, 1968).

Peterson, R. E. (1968). The student left in American higher education. *Daedalus, 97*, 293-317.

Phi Delta Kappan. (1967). *49*, 161.

Simmons, J. F., & Winograd, B. (1966) *It's happening*. Santa Barbara, CA: Marc-Laird Publications.

Simonsen, E. (1968). *The president and the student*. Address presented at the National Conference on the Junior College President. University of California, Los Angeles, July 15-17. Los Angeles: University of California.

State Board of Education. (January 1967). 294 F. 2d 150 (1961) appeal from *Dixon v. Alabama, 186* F. suppl. 945 (M. D. Ala. 196), quoted in *College and University Business* 42:60.

Suarez, J. (October 12, 1967). Junior colleges not places to breed participation. *Los Angeles Collegian*.

Tozzi, M., (Editor-in-Chief). (March 31, 1967). *Pierce College Roundup*.

Trombley, W. July 4, 1968. "Raid Clouds Future of Promising Stony Brook University." *Los Angeles Times*.

"V. Meetings Involving Off-Campus Speakers." (July 1, 1966). *Regulations on the Use of UCLA Facilities by Students and Registered Student Organization*, Mimeo p.8–10.

Walsh, L. E. (1968). *Alumni recommendations for the future government and operation of Columbia University*. New York: Alumni Federation of Columbia University, Inc.

Chapter 11

A CONTEMPORARY VIEW OF THE ISSUES

Arthur M. Cohen

The foregoing chapters reveal John Lombardi's belief in the community college as a common school and in the dignity of the students and staff members who comprise the institution. Each reveals not only Lombardi's views but also the status of college enrollments, finances, curriculum, and staffing at the time he was writing. He wrote most of the papers in reaction to the statements put forth by people who he felt either did not understand the possibilities and limitations of the community colleges or who, in their zeal to aggrandize the institutions, made claims that could never be realized.

How have the events of recent years confirmed or refuted Lombardi's analyses? The idea of the common school in which he so firmly believed has come under a dual assault: from those who think the public schools incapable of achieving anything useful and hence want their funds diverted to private academies; and from the separatists who, under the banner of group identity and empowerment, advocate segregating students, faculty, and curriculum along ethnic lines. The academic standards that he felt were necessary to genuine educational attainment sank under the pressure of a continual decline in student achievement and have had to be doggedly defended in rear-guard actions. He favored low tuition even though he predicted that it would increase and indeed, student fees have been raised repeatedly as the colleges in every state suffer shortfalls in income because of tax revolts and competition from other agencies. The open access that he advanced has been threatened by enrollment caps and by limited state reimbursements for certain curriculums. In general, the colleges have been challenged repeatedly for their inability to mitigate all human ills. Lombardi would not be surprised at that.

This chapter summarizes the trends in each area that Lombardi wrote about. It updates some of his references and data and brings his analyses into the context of the 1990s. It is not a commentary on his values or on the accuracy of his assessments. Rather, it is a contemporary review provided by one who also loves the idea of the open-access community college and who seeks unceasingly to understand its processes and effects.

Enrollments

The 18-year-old high school graduates, the basic pool from which all colleges traditionally have drawn the majority of their entrants, grew steadily from the turn of the 20th century until the 1960s. This growth was magnified not only by an increasing U.S. population but also by annual gains in the percentage of 18-year-olds finishing high school which, from 6.4 percent in 1900, reached 76.7 percent by 1964. And there it stabilized with little variation in the ensuing years; in 1991 it was 75.7 percent.

This past quarter-century plateau in the percentage of the population graduating high school would have led to a plateau in the number of people entering college except for two phenomena: between 1964 and 1991 the total population of 17-year-olds in the United States increased from 2,978,000 to 3,325,000; and the college enrollment rates went up from 48.3 percent to 59.6 percent of those who did graduate. Thus the total number of recent high school graduates entering college increased from 1,037,000 to 1,463,000, a gain of 41 percent in the 25-year span. However, during those same years, enrollment in public two-year colleges increased from around 740,000 to more than 5 million (National Center for Education Statistics, 1992). Clearly those additional students did not come solely from the increased population of recent high school graduates. The community colleges did get their share of young students—in 1987 they enrolled over 1.5 million students aged 21 or younger, 60 percent of whom attended full time—but over three million students were attending part time and their median age was nearly 30.

This massive shift in enrollments occurred because all the elements to support it were in place. The community colleges' policies favored part-time attendance so that young adults could maintain family responsibilities and jobs while going to school. The colleges' breadth in programming, open-access admissions policies, forgiveness for prior academic sins, and off-campus and night courses all suggested a welcome for the older students. Most important, basic demography enhanced the increase: the total population of 18- to 24-year-olds in America moved hardly at all between 1972 and 1988, from 26,077,000 to 26,888,000, but the population of 25- to 34-year-olds went up from 27,623,000 to 43,886,000, a 59 percent gain. The colleges were ready for the influx of adults and in it came.

During the 1960s and 1970s the number of public two-year colleges more than doubled, from 374 to 864: "A new college every week" was the proudly repeated slogan. But the growth subsided and the decade of the 1980s saw hardly any new two-year colleges constructed. Thus the colleges individually have grown larger along with the population but there has been little need recently for new institutions to be created. There is a community college located within commuting distance of nearly 95 percent of the people in all the large-population states.

Although the population of the United States has increased, it has been uneven. For the most part it has taken place in areas of high immigration, not only because of the new adults who need education in language, culture, and job skills that will enable them to enter the societal mainstream, but also because the immigrant groups tend to have more children who seek basic schooling. Between 1979 and 1989 the community colleges in Florida, Texas, and Illinois experienced growth rates higher than other large states while Ohio and New York were far below the growth norm (National Center for Education Statistics, 1991 b). United States immigration policy has become as influential as state policy in determining enrollment growth.

In light of these enrollment figures it seems unnecessary for college leaders to continue calling for increased numbers, but many of them figuratively wring their hands at any enrollment decline, no matter how modest. They reiterate the claims made by their predecessors of the 1970s; the colleges can mitigate both unemployment and the untoward effects of the American social-class system. An argument might be made that no matter how well a product is known, its manufacturer still must continue advertising its merits lest the competition capture the market. And the community colleges do have many competitors: adult schools; proprietary schools; publicly supported trade schools; and universities, still maintaining first claim on students who are qualified for admission to the freshman class and who can afford the higher tuition. But the claims for institutional benefit are directed less at the consumers, the prospective students, than they are at the funding agencies, the legislatures from which institutional support is derived.

How much should the colleges' leaders seek to aggrandize enrollment? During the 1970s many colleges adopted what they unashamedly called marketing techniques in their efforts to boost enrollments. This was an era when state support was available for as many students as could be enticed to come through the doors. Accordingly, it was not unusual for non-credit-bearing activities and events to be redefined as credit courses so that the state reimbursements would be enhanced. Growth has always been perceived as a good. It is easier to manage expansion than to manage decline, hence a new program that might capture a few new students has been a valued commodity. And the college leaders typically applauded the enrollment growth as an affirmation of institutional value. Thus the "more is better loop" was closed.

Recently however, the claims for unending growth and value have had to be tempered, not because the administrators changed their views but because the specifications for state reimbursement changed. Several states began capping growth in the early 1980s and by the end of the decade the colleges in many states had been notified that any further growth would not be funded. By way of enforcing a reduction in institutional expansion, many states tightened requirements on the types of courses and programs for which they would provide reimbursement. The impetus was not a shift in educational philosophy but in the willingness to pay for unlimited growth. Hence the definition of credit course was restricted and the institutions' actions in converting marginal activities into reimbursable programs were curtailed.

Many college leaders have attempted to cling to the belief that growth is good. They continue to argue that the colleges can enhance economic growth and employment in their regions. However, the evidence to support this contention is anecdotal and meager. Furthermore, when unemployment is high, state revenues fall, and immediate relief in the form of public welfare competes with the idea of greater funding for college programs that are directed toward worker retraining.

The argument that the community colleges cost less than the universities similarly draws little support. If the legislatures believed that the colleges could provide equivalency at the freshman and sophomore level for less money, they would act to severely restrict the universities' entrants, even to the extent of maintaining upper division universities and/or demanding that the universities hold space in their junior class for all students wishing to transfer. Except in a few cases, this has not happened.

In general, the same forces that shifted enrollments in recent years will affect them for the rest of the century. The population bulge of the 25- to 34-year-olds is passing through, hence that age group will not sustain further enrollment increases. State budgets will continue to be tightly restrained, and federal student aid, never nearly as influential a factor in community colleges as in proprietary schools and universities, will not rise to replace it. Except in a few isolated areas of heavy immigration, the college leaders will have to live with stasis or decline.

Eventually the situation will change. A new wave of population is coming through the lower schools and will reach college age early in the 21st century. And once again, the cry, "We must be doing something right; look at the students flocking to our doors," will be heard. But in the meantime the colleges where growth remains the *sine qua non* will have to publicize their programs for people seeking to upgrade or change their careers. Or they will have to shift much of the cost to the students themselves. The most sensible college leaders, however, will continue emphasizing what the colleges do best (i.e., transfer and literacy studies and job entry programs), seek support through traditional channels, and maintain close relationships with the lower schools in their locality to ensure that they receive a substantial number of qualified entrants. As it always has, demography will exert the most powerful influence on enrollments.

Finance

According to President Truman's 1947 Commission on Higher Education, half the young people of America could profit from attending grades 13 and 14. The Commission was headed by George Zook, himself a community college leader, and it confirmed the institution's place as an extension of the secondary school where in most states it had begun. As such, its funding sources might logically be similar to those supporting the lower schools. Indeed, in 1950, half the public community college income was derived from the local taxing districts, with another one-fourth coming from the states.

Public community college financing has changed since the Truman Commission report. Tuition, which accounted for 9 percent of the colleges' total income in 1950, comprised 16 percent in 1989. Federal aid, negligible until the 1960s, has reached 10 percent, nearly all of it in the form of Pell Grants and other awards to students. State and local funds together equal 64 percent of college income, although the local portion has diminished from half of that in the 1960s to under one-fourth of it. Sales and services, 7 percent, and other, 4 percent, make up the remainder. These changes have occurred sporadically. State and federal aid for programs serving special groups has become more prominent. Tuition has increased in every state and, during the 1980s, came even to California, the last hold-out. Nationwide, the median is more than $750 per year and is rising annually (National Center for Education Statistics, 1991 a).

The way that the colleges spend their money has changed as well. Of the nearly $15 billion that the public community colleges received in 1989, 43 percent went for instruction, 50 percent for administration, and 7 percent for scholarships. These ratios in 1977 were 52 percent for instruction, 45 percent for administration, and 3 percent for scholarships. Much of the increased proportion for administration came about because of the high costs associated with managing the categorical aid funds and in ensuring compliance with state and federal regulations governing numerous aspects of institutional functioning.

Comparisons of funding sources and expenditures between the community colleges, the universities, and the lower schools are not useful because each sector provides different types of programs. The costs of the universities' research and graduate-school functions cannot be readily disaggregated from the lower-division programs. The compulsory aspects of the lower schools and the restricted age group that they serve make them different. By revolutionizing access to post-compulsory education the community colleges beg different paradigms for cost accounting. Average daily attendance measures, costs divided by number of degrees awarded to or jobs attained by the students, reimbursement on the basis of program costs; none seem quite to capture the essence of the institution.

In 1990 Proposition 98 in California placed the community colleges along with the K–12 system for funding purposes. But a couple of years earlier an assembly bill had moved the colleges toward higher education by mandating many changes including shared governance and the abandonment of faculty credentialing by the state. In California and elsewhere the states were limiting the types of courses for which the colleges would be reimbursed. Now, instead of redefining as many activities as possible into credit course format in order to receive state reimbursement, the colleges were seeking ways of labeling courses as noncredit so that they could collect higher fees from the students. The standards for curriculum, credit courses, and transfer and vocational classifications were, are, and will be as elastic as the funding categories. And the place of the community college as an upward extension of the public schools or as a form of higher education is as indistinct as it ever was.

Lombardi firmly believed that public education through grade 13 or 14 should be readily available in colleges operating at low cost, with the students paying little and the budgets closely watched. He viewed with ill-disguised scorn the college leaders who spent all the districts' reserves in expectation that the state would make up any shortfall and he was not sympathetic to the governing-board members who voted salary increases for the staff even when a budgetary deficit was imminent. When collective bargaining for public employees led to the unions' taking control of board elections he expressed concern that with the employee groups effectually sitting on both sides of the bargaining table, no one would be managing the budgets on behalf of the public.

Lombardi knew that low tuition could not be sustained. Economists have long debated the merits of low-tuition higher education in the context of the community colleges as well as the universities. Recently most economists have come to the conclusion that in order to avoid the regressive taxation aspect of a non-compulsory institution which the children of the rich invariably attend in greater numbers than the children of the poor, the institutions should charge high tuition with financial aid made available to the lower income families. Nice in theory, but in practice, the states have steadily raised tuition in their public colleges and universities, promising that substantial amounts of financial aid will be made available so that the low-income families will not be shut out, with the financial aid increases never quite equaling the increased tuition costs.

Instead the states are more likely to use the tuition increase as an excuse for lowering the amount of direct support for the institutions and to direct the savings to other programs. Support for higher education is not unitary, with a fixed amount or proportion of state revenue used for the colleges and universities. If it were, higher tuition and concomitant lower state appropriations could lead directly to higher state financial aid for students.

The higher education systems compete for state funds with other state-supported agencies including prisons, welfare, health care, and so on. A dollar gained through higher tuition charges does not translate into a dollar spent for student aid. Furthermore, substantial financial aid for low-income people means that income verification must be made; often this leads to various forms of subterfuge and deception on the part of people who have much to gain by concealing income. Lombardi deplored the community colleges' drift toward becoming agents of income redistribution, viewing them as schools, refusing to accept their role as extensions of the welfare agencies. Still, he foresaw tuition increases, financial aid abuse, frequent budgetary crises, and an institution caught between some of the less admirable aspects of both higher education and public school financing.

In the nations of the European Community, tuition costs to students in higher education are minimal or nonexistent, but those nations can provide the services because a much smaller proportion of their young people go to college. In addition the Europeans tend to fund occupational education through publicly supported apprenticeships, labor union-based training programs, job-site training, and other activities that take place outside the formal higher education structure. A much higher proportion of public job-training funds runs to the colleges in the United States. Recent efforts to move the administration of federal aid to students in proprietary schools to the U.S. Labor Department has been occasioned by an attempt to reduce student loan default and various other abuses. (By 1990 the rate of default in guaranteed student loans had reached more than $1.6 billion.)

Might the Labor Department do a better job of monitoring the flow of funds? The highest proportion of the loan defaults and abuse of Pell Grants was taking place in the proprietary schools. Accordingly, many university spokespersons tried to label this form of support as labor market education, as differentiated from higher education. The community colleges whose students tended to default on loans at a rate higher than that of university students but lower than the proprietary schools had to argue for continued aid for students from low-income families while seeking to distance themselves from the latter institutions.

Conceptually, community college financing differs too in the way that programs for adults are funded. Education for part-time students seeking cultural, social, and personal interest courses is supposed to be self-supporting. Community college non-credit courses suggest that education for personal consumption, as differentiated from that for the good of society, should be paid for by the individuals who benefit from it. But many adults attend credit courses even though they seek neither job training nor access to the baccalaureate. A 1986 study found 15 percent of the students enrolled in credit courses indicating that personal interest, not getting a job or transferring to the university, was their primary reason for attending (Cohen and Brawer, 1989). Other nations have been more vigorous in steering these personal interest students to self-pay activities or programs funded by the government but provided through community education structures operated through local government agencies. The American universities tend to shunt them to their extension divisions. The community colleges function in a shadow world of enrollment-driven, program-differentiated funding for students whose aspirations are as mercurial as their use of the institution is indistinct. As Adelman has noted, the colleges serve an occasional role for people "in transit from one status to another. . . . The universes of the labor market and baccalaureate education, however complex, have far more definite boundaries, rules, and expectations in the lives of individuals than does the community college (1992, p. 23)."

In the early 1990s some subtle shifts in funding were apparent, most at the federal level where $10 billion for student aid was being appropriated annually to all post-compulsory education. The government was also recommending free choice, a voucher plan for the public schools, signalling a move away from the common school. The United States Education Department was setting itself up as a testing agency, defining the level and content of tests that should be administered for school accountability. Much was being done in the name of determining which students were able to benefit from post-secondary study. The government was able to make these moves that were new to Americans because of the power of the purse, its distribution of financial aid upon which sizable numbers of institutions and students depended. Not incidentally this also had the effect of elevating the media to the position of monitoring higher education. All was becoming public information through the use of test information and graduation rates that the colleges for years had neglected to publicize. The college managers who must sustain the flow of funds into their institutions were learning new ways of understanding their environments.

Faculty Workload

Faculty workload. The term always connotes the classroom hours times the number of students enrolled, occasionally with a nod to committee service. No one speaks of a professor's research load, scholarship load, or consulting load. The teaching is the ponderous portion of the profession, the burden to be carried.

Prior to the 1960s the community colleges operated under work rules much like those in the secondary schools. The principal, president, or governing board set the hours and working conditions and hired and fired the staff. The AAUP statements regarding academic freedom had never quite penetrated. Then, when rules authorizing public employee bargaining units were passed, the rules changed. Collective bargaining spread until it formed the basis of faculty negotiations for around 60 percent of the community college instructors. Its period of rapid growth ended in the 1980s as state legislatures stopped passing laws demanding that the college governing boards recognize faculty bargaining units. But where it was in place, it formed the basis of workload negotiation, with the administrators effectually shunted aside.

There is little difference in faculty workload in states where a majority of the faculty are covered under collective bargaining agreements (California, Illinois, Michigan, New York) and those where the faculty are not so covered (Texas, Arizona, Utah). The major contrast is in administrative involvement in setting the working conditions for the faculty. The negotiations yield contracts that move nearly all decisions to the level of the negotiators; i.e., the board and the faculty unit representatives. The attorneys for both groups are involved in interpreting the contracts and in arbitrating the disputes. The choice for the administrators is not whether they approve of such contracts but only of how they learn to live with them. Many of the administrators in states where bargaining began were slow to realize that. It is difficult for people who grew up with a perception of their professional role as one of closely managing staff behavior to realize that the rules have shifted, that the contract negotiated with the staff has become the dominant force. Years after the faculty won the right to bargain collectively, this perception seems quaint, but at the time Lombardi wrote, it was high on the list of administrator's concerns.

Lombardi's comments on faculty workload reflect his attitudes toward his professional colleagues: administrators and faculty alike. To the administrators who fulminated about the contracts that were taking away their right to assign and release faculty members he counseled patience: It's inevitable. Learn to live with it. Don't think that you can control the negotiating process. And don't make assertions that will come back to haunt you when it is over.

To the faculty Lombardi was even more indulgent. He knew that the contracts would not change their work life but only the patterns of interactions between them and the administrators; and then only temporarily. His advice to them was amicable, sometimes paternalistic. He took a derisive view of instructors who fought for reduced teaching hours on the grounds that they needed more time to prepare for class and to read the students' papers and who simultaneously petitioned to teach overload classes at additional pay. He readily acknowledged that what the faculty did on their own time was no one's business, but he deplored the cynical attitude that led them at once to plead for fewer teaching hours and sign up for additional classes.

The years have validated his concerns. The contracts now spell out every detail of class size, teaching hours, hours to be spent on campus, leaves of absence, committee service, and at least a dozen or two other aspects of faculty life. (See, for examples, the agreements negotiated among the colleges in Florida, Michigan, Oregon, and Pennsylvania in the late 1980s, noted under National Education Association authorship in the bibliography.) The number of hours that a full-time instructor spends in the classroom is essentially the same as it has been for decades, and the percentage of these instructors who teach overload assignments for additional pay is, if anything, higher; e.g., 40 percent of the full timers in California teach overload (California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, 1989 b).

The complaints about heavy teaching loads are constant as well. When compared with the universities where a full load may be six or nine hours per term, the community colleges' median load of 13 to 15 hours does seem excessive. And the instructors are not shy about saying so, especially those who are active in their disciplinary associations. Calls for reduced loads appear frequently in nationally circulated publications such as *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, in disciplinary association newsletters, and in papers that the faculty prepare indigenously or as a concomitant of their enrollment in a graduate program. The arguments are straightforward: We teach liberal arts classes to freshmen and sophomores, just as the university professors do. In fact, our job is harder because our students are less well prepared. And the professors have teaching assistants, too. Why should we be expected to teach for twice as many hours per week?

Despite the perennial contentions, the workload is not changing. There is no concerted effort to build teaching assistants into the community college instructional pattern. Few sustained innovative practices that would teach more students with fewer instructor-contact hours are being introduced. Demands that the full-time instructors be awarded rights of first refusal when overload classes are imminent continue unabated. Differentiated staffing or a system of master teachers supervising a corps of aides might serve to break the pattern. But so far, with rare exception, the faculty tend to teach in the same ways to the same number of students for the same number of hours as their predecessors did a generation ago.

Part-Time Faculty

More so than in the universities, less so than in adult schools and extension divisions, the community colleges depend on a part-time work force. The reasons the part timers continue to be employed in sizable numbers are that they cost less, they may have special capabilities not available among the full-time instructors, and they can be employed, dismissed, and re-employed as necessary. The issues surrounding their use include their qualifications, pay scales, and job rights.

Although the colleges have always employed part timers, their rapid expansion in the early 1970s led them to bring them aboard in increasing numbers. From a ratio of 40 percent of the faculty in 1971, the part timers numbered 50 percent in 1974. By the end of the decade the ratio had risen to around 58 percent and there it has stayed. The colleges had come to depend on low-cost labor to balance the budget. As Lombardi noted, "As long as administrators are not constrained by law or collective bargaining agreements they will continue to employ lower paid part-time instructors . . . as one means of effecting savings." Part-time instructors are to the community colleges what migrant workers are to the farms.

The most positive aspects of the part timers are seen where they are business or professional people conversant with the latest developments in their field by virtue of their concurrent involvement with it. They also enable small colleges to offer courses for which a full-time load could not be mounted; a religious studies or Great Books course, for example. And they allow the colleges to meet a last-minute demand for an extra section of a popular course. The worst features of their use are when the college brings in two or more part timers to teach similar courses as a way of avoiding employing a full timer.

Are the part timers qualified? They are less likely than the full timers to hold doctoral degrees and less experienced in teaching. But the days of putting an unqualified person in the classroom on an emergency credential merely to have someone to sustain the routines have long past. Nearly all the part-time instructors have academic course work, degrees, or experience that fits the instruction they conduct. They are as concerned for their students and as interested in their work. They get their grades in on time and their students are just as satisfied with the courses they conduct. On an objective basis their activities in the classroom are no different from those pursued by the full timers. Were it not for the constant pressure put forth by the faculty organizations that are dominated by the full timers, the question of part-time faculty use would never be raised.

The issues raised by the full timers typically center on the activities that an instructor conducts outside the classroom. The full timers maintain office hours, select textbooks and media, plan programs and curriculum, serve on institutional-welfare committees, sustain a more involved professional posture. How much is that worth to a college? To the observer who plots only classroom hours as an indicator of faculty functioning, not much. To one who views the faculty as a professional group involved fully in the life of the institution, a great deal.

Accordingly, rules governing the employment of part timers are continually being formed. The collective bargaining agreements may specify job rights, pay scales, and a limit on the number of classes that they may teach. Accrediting agencies may comment adversely if it appears that an excessive number of classes are met by part timers. And legal decisions and legislation frequently suggest that part timers should have rights to continuing employment or pro rata pay.

The pay rates are key to the part timers' employment. When fringe benefits are included in the calculation, the California rate in 1987 was just over half that of the full timers. But that is only after ten hours per week were added for the full timers' out-of-class activities. Taking it strictly on a per class basis, the part timers cost considerably less. Their hourly pay rate averaged $27.00 and they earned around $1,400 for a three-unit course. The full timers were paid on average $36,000 plus fringe benefits for a total of $43,000 for teaching ten classes per year; i.e., $4,300 per class, or around three times as much. By 1989 the annual salary for full-time faculty members in California had risen to a mean of more than $44,000 (California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, 1989 a).

Other states show similar patterns. The nine-month salary for full-time faculty in Illinois in 1989 was $40,434 (Illinois Community College Board, 1991). This represented a 23 percent increase in the four years between 1987 and 1991. Like California the part timers were being paid at a rate about one-third as great: $1,059 per three-credit course. The full timers teaching overload courses averaged $1,287 per course. The sizable gains in compensation made by community college instructors during the 1980s had been made by the full timers.

A curious question of pedagogical involvement appears in any comparison of part-time and full-time instructors. In 1987, 60 percent of the California community college instructors were part timers and they were teaching 32 percent of the class hours in the state, figures that held steady throughout the 1980s. One-fourth of the part timers were also teaching part-time at another institution and nearly all of them had other jobs outside the college. But 40 percent of the full timers also had other jobs and they were teaching 28 percent of the credit course hours on an overload basis. Is a class taught by a part timer who teaches additional classes elsewhere or who has another job qualitatively different from a class taught as overload by a full timer, who, in addition, also has an outside job?

Questions of whether the states should restrict the percentage of credit courses that part timers might teach or whether the part timers should be entitled to continuing employment continued to concern the policy analysts. Whether the part timers should be required to spend some number of hours outside of class advising students and developing curriculum was also a concern, with the issue being whether the districts could be required to pay the part timers for such activities. No one was arguing that they could be required to participate in out-of-class activities unless additional compensation were made available.

Although the part timers and full timers are members of the same bargaining unit in most unionized districts, they work under different sets of regulations concerning salaries, rehires, and evaluation. The full-time instructors seek proportionate salary for their overload teaching: their regular salary of $40,000 per year for teaching ten courses should convert to $4,000 additional for the eleventh and subsequent courses. But then it becomes difficult for them to argue against the part timers' also receiving $4,000 per course, obviously a budget wrecker. Rules governing continuing employment are the prime concern for the part timers. They have made some gains; more than half of the 71 community college districts in California have some rights for the part timers included, usually a guarantee of continuing contract and pay increments if they teach the same courses successively (California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, 1987).

Some analysts have observed that different types of part timers should be paid on different scales. Some part timers are "volunteers": retired teachers, business or professional people, or other citizens not dependent on the funds they receive for teaching. Others are "captives," teachers with no other sources of income, most of whom aspire to full-time employment (56 percent of the part timers responding to a survey at Pima Community College said they would apply for a full-time position if one were available [Silvers, 1990]). The same wage scale, they contend, should not be used for both groups. The course hour should not be the standard for pay.

Lombardi pointed out that "The industrial pattern of higher rates for overtime has not been adopted by or forced upon educational institutions," and speculated that it was because overtime is not onerous but is "an easy method of increasing one's pay." He predicted the current trend toward pro rata pay, saying that the administrators would then have to look elsewhere for ways of offsetting increased costs. But where? He considered augmented state and federal aid, vastly higher tuition charges, and a change in the labor-intensive character of teaching, and saw none of them as likely. His prediction of pro rata or at least more proportionate pay for full timers and part timers and a reduced number of part timers has not yet been realized, the first because the full timers have attained sizable pay raises and the second because no one has determined a means of balancing the instructional budget, short of relying on cheap labor.

Department Chair

The middle-management position between the top administrators and the faculty has always been a difficult spot to occupy because the department or division chair has to please both groups. The plethora of types of duties, from faculty evaluation to student-flow data management, and the typical practice of being named to the job without having been trained for it, add to the difficulty. Contractual proscriptions or institutional precedent further circumscribe the chair's role, often assigning responsibilities even while limiting powers. The chairs' feeling frequently that they are standing in front of a glass wall with both sides shooting at them is understandable.

Aware of the problems indigenous to the chairs' role, Lombardi encouraged them to take heart. His advice was that they should not attempt to overmanage. They should be humane and quick to commend the instructors for any achievement. They should act to sustain a clean and pleasant working environment for the faculty and to collect data on the number of students completing the various courses and on the instructors' abilities to retain students. This sounds minimal but it stems from Lombardi's knowledge of the restrictions of the role.

Not much has changed. The negotiated contracts of the 1970s circumscribed the chairs' ability to hire and fire instructors and the shared governance of the 1990s further restricted their powers as it brought the faculty more toward negotiating their perquisites and working conditions directly with the chief administrators. The department chairs never had considered collecting data on students to be a central responsibility. What was left for them?

A study of supervisors, chairpersons, and faculty at Delaware Technical and Community College (Winner, 1989) found all three groups agreeing that the chairs had major responsibility for identifying departmental personnel needs, evaluating the staff, establishing departmental curricular goals, evaluating instructional materials, and representing the department to the administration and to the public. But at least 40 additional things that chairs should do were also identified, most of them quite generalized, such as "assess the communication among departmental personnel," and "utilize committees relative to the accomplishment of departmental functions (pp. 45–46)." The study concluded with a list of seven roles and 28 functions that chairpersons should perform.

Some studies assign faculty development roles to the department chairs. Scott (1990) suggests that the chairs should develop faculty orientation sessions and attend to continuing development for the staff. Other studies see a more bureaucratic role for them. Elliott (1983) contended that the chairs have an increased responsibility in legal affairs. Accordingly they should require that the instructors have written syllabi available for all students at the beginning of the course, take care that the instructors have well-articulated criteria for student grades, evaluate the faculty members regularly, ensure that faculty advising is done properly. The reason is that all of these areas have been the subject of litigation on the part of students or faculty members and the courts have always taken a dim view of vaguely worded criteria for conduct expected of either group.

Hammons (1984), who has studied department chairs more extensively than anyone else, reviewed a great number of studies of chairperson responsibilities and activities and identified at least forty different functions categorized under five major headings: administration, student-oriented, business and financial, faculty-oriented, and curriculum and instruction. He found a major problem to be that few of the chairs had received any pre-service assistance in learning what their responsibilities were or how to conduct them and concluded that the role of the chair is among the most nebulous in the institution. Numerous responsibilities, most of them vaguely worded, are assigned, but few opportunities to learn how to manage them are provided. The department chair maintains its eminence as the position for which the least amount of guidance is offered.

Portolan (1992) confirmed that the instructional administrators she studied seemed to be experiencing a middle manager syndrome of feeling ineffective and powerless. Faced with changing student populations, limited resources, and a range of faculty issues they had not been prepared to handle, they were developing feelings of alienation toward their work. In California the reform legislation carried in Assembly Bill 1725 had put the faculty more in command of their own working conditions and correspondingly further diminished the role for the department chairs.

An association of instructional administrators was founded in California in 1989 to try to support these middle managers and also to engage as a communications network whereby the members could share ideas. In the absence of any other formal training mechanism, the instructional administrators took it on themselves to teach each other. A needs assessment conducted by the association supported the preconceptions underlying the organization's founding by pointing out how the members were convinced that they were not consulted when decisions were made by the faculty leaders or by the chief administrators in the colleges.

The changes in managerial roles occasioned by collective bargaining and shared governance will settle down eventually. But first, each college has to go through the same process: listing the chairs' responsibilities; discerning the limitations of the role; testing the chairs' powers through administrative fiat, contractual negotiations or committee action; and then settling back to a nebulous area of vaguely worded functions that are usually sustained to a greater or lesser degree depending on the chairs' personality, values, and intellect. Not much there for those who believe in the power of rules by which an institution should operate, but a lot for the devotees of college as a minimally organized anarchy.

Vocational Education

Lombardi wrote about vocational education when it was in the middle years of its ascendancy from a minor place in the curriculum to the prominent place that it occupied in the latter 1980s. He pointed out how students would not enroll in programs leading to dead-end jobs; they wanted the baccalaureate as their ticket to advancement on the ladder of occupational status. Not the fault of the educational system, he pointed out, but of the prestige that society awarded to certain occupations. As he noted, all education is vocational in nature but some vocations are more equal than others.

Still vocational education persisted. Beginning as a dream held by the community college advocates of the 1930s and 1940s, it languished until the Vocational Education Act of 1963 set it on the road to sizable financing by the federal government. Brint and Karabel (1989) documented the national community college leaders' obsession with vocational education, but not until the national government poured money into it did the job-gaining portion of community college education take off. It has not expanded and taken over a majority of the curriculum and student body as some of its more pronounced devotees had hoped, but neither has it shrunk in favor of the general education/liberal arts/transfer-centered curriculum so desired by those who felt that the community colleges should strive to move everyone toward the baccalaureate. The liberal arts and occupational studies have maintained equilibrium over the past two decades. About 50 percent of the class enrollments are in sciences, social sciences, humanities, English usage, mathematics, and fine and performing arts, and the other 50 percent are in business, technologies, health care fields, service occupations, and vocational studies.

The liberal arts and the occupational courses exist in parallel; the many attempts to merge them have had little success. Courses in history, biology, or English are still much like those taught in the lower division of universities. However, a merger has been effected at the program or curriculum level. The occupations for which community college students are preparing demand ever-higher levels of literacy, including computational literacy. The liberal arts courses are not esoteric, they are basic to a student's functioning in an economy that centers on providing services and processing information. The job-oriented students are directed toward the liberal arts courses both because the job market requires the skills they teach and because the state agencies have retained general education requirements in nearly all programs. Accordingly, 25 percent of the students sitting in liberal arts classes have avowedly occupational objectives and 25 percent of the students sitting in occupationally directed classes hold transfer to the university as their primary goal for attending (Palmer, 1987). The separation between occupational and liberal arts programs, never as marked as the curriculum organizers and funding agencies tried to make them appear, is less marked than ever. The most comprehensive view of occupational and liberal arts studies suggests that they do relate to each other and that the occupational programs are as likely to lead to transfer to universities as they are to immediate employment.

However, the product of community colleges as measured by degree attainment displays continued growth for the vocational function. Between 1971 and 1982, vocationally oriented associate degrees grew from 51 percent to 71 percent of the 560,000 degrees awarded (Grubb, 1988). Most were in business, the mechanical technologies, and health services, with electronics and data processing growing rapidly but still accounting for a small percentage of the whole. Much of the growth was related to the process of certification. A student wishing to enter a career as a health service worker or a laboratory technician often must present the degree, whereas for the student wishing to transfer credits to the university, the associate in arts degree is superfluous; the student need only show a transcript of courses completed.

The rationale for expanding occupational preparation programs is no different than it ever was. People need to work, and the community needs trained workers. Human capital formation is the highest form of economic development that a nation can engage in. Some additional nuances have been added, sustaining international competitiveness, for example, but the basic purposes for job training remain constant. The part-time attendance pattern manifested by most community college students reveals many people working in one type of occupation while attending school to accredit themselves for a better job in the same field or in a different field. The community college is no more or less vocationalized than the rest of higher education; it merely prepares people for work in less highly professionalized fields.

This core rationale has led the federal government to continue funding occupational studies at a generous rate. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 has been followed by a splendid array of succeeding acts: Job Training Partnership Act; Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act; and Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Act are the most prominent. But there are also the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act, Worksite Literacy Program, Cooperative Education Act, and various forms of specially funded federal student aid programs and state-level job-training programs. Within these legislative mandates are funds for summer youth employment and training, training assistance for dislocated workers and for all sorts of other special groups, including migrant farm workers, veterans, Native Americans and so on. The sum of funds available through these programs reaches into the billions and, according to McKinney and Davis (1988), the community colleges receive around 23 percent of them.

The colleges have responded with an array of services built in cooperation with local businesses and with curriculum links to secondary schools and universities. High school occupational studies have been linked with community college curricula. Worksite-based projects have been built in association with industries. Partnerships between the colleges and major employers have been organized. Small business development centers and cooperative education programs have been created Apprenticeship programs and specially tailored certificate programs are firmly in place. Customized training for special industries is a feature in many applications.

These types of programs, too numerous to detail here, are reported in the literature emanating from the individual colleges and from their state and national associations. Three ERIC papers alone list nearly one hundred different centers, programs, and projects provided by community colleges across the country (Zeiss, 1991; Palmer, 1990; Katsinas and Lacey, 1989). They show that the concept of vocational studies as preparing people for work in a mill or on an assembly line is archaic. The most liberal education is that which prepares people for employment; the most occupationally relevant education is that which enhances literacy, understanding, and the ability to think critically. The merger has been in effect for a long time, ever since the shop courses gave way to the technologies. The students know it. They know they have to take science, math, and English before being admitted to, or concurrent with, their health and computer programs. The enlightened administrators know it, although, in their need to maximize the funds coming to the colleges, they court the legislators who are more likely to generously support programs that promise to relieve unemployment. The curricula that are listed as vocational include a sizable proportion of their content in the liberal arts.

Lombardi commented that vocational education had difficulty in becoming popular because of the students' desire to obtain the baccalaureate. He recommended occupational studies with open entry and exit, and he predicted that the vocational schools would become colleges. Events have sustained his predictions. The most successful occupational programs are those that articulate with baccalaureate programs, the two-plus-two curricula. Many occupational programs allow the students to enter and leave as their personal circumstances dictate. And the greatest growth in postsecondary education in the past 20 years has been in the proprietary trade schools, up from less than 1,500 in 1970 to as many as 9,000 in 1990. They have taken on the characteristics of colleges to the extent that many of them award associate degrees, and that as a group, their students attain over 25 percent of all Pell Grants that are awarded.

The future of vocational education looks bright, though some changes are imminent. The enrollment and funding caps will limit the introduction of new programs. In 1991, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board adopted a policy of linking approval of new associate degrees to the college's job-training record: "An institution must show that 85 percent of the students completing existing technical programs over a three-year period are employed or pursuing additional education (p. 2)." And the specifications for the Job Training Partnership Act put limits on the programs that a community college may offer for adults because educational attainment per se is not considered a successful training outcome, and "local officials often require providers to offer only short-term, non credit, open-entry/open-exit programming (Eaton, 1992, p. 44)." More than in any other area, the spectre of institutional accountability looms over the occupational programs. But they are so popular in an era of intense economic competitiveness that modest change in format is about all that will differentiate them from their predecessors.

Developmental Education

The community colleges' engagement with students who need various types of less-than-college-level instruction has led them to develop special courses and programs for this clientele. Variously called remedial, developmental, compensatory, adult basic education, general education development, and programs for the handicapped, these activities constitute a sizable proportion of the community colleges' educational effort. Taken broadly, they represent a third major function, not as comprehensive as the pre-baccalaureate and occupational effort, but certainly more stable than community services.

Developmental education is a natural concomitant of the community colleges' policy of open access. If anyone may enroll, then the institutions will certainly matriculate a group whose prior academic attainment does not qualify them to engage in college-level studies. And if these students are enrolled in sizable numbers, then special courses and programs must be developed for them, because placing them in courses where the instruction is beyond their comprehension without providing auxiliary support services only presents them with the right to fail and the frustration that accompanies that right. The efforts to instruct these students in a manner that will assist them in learning what they need to enter the pre-baccalaureate or occupational programs or to go on to other pursuits reflect the community colleges' central purpose: providing basic educational services to the entire community.

Developmental education has a broad scope. Lombardi divided it into four parts: studies designed to prepare students to take college-level courses, which he called *pre-transfer*; instruction for students who need basic help with the three "Rs," which he called *remedial*; high school make-up or adult literacy, *adult basic education*; and services for students with physical or mental handicaps, *handicapped*. English as a Second Language, a function that has grown large since Lombardi was writing, is sometimes now considered part of the colleges' developmental function.

The pre-transfer studies, designed to prepare students to enter the college-level courses, have been offered in all types of colleges throughout their history. Every institution has had students who want to enroll but whose academic skills are deemed inadequate for traditional course work. The courses designed to overcome these deficiencies are usually offered in the academic departments, especially in English and mathematics and, to a lesser extent, in the sciences.

The remedial programs for students who need help in basic literacy and study skills are provided for the students whose literacy levels are somewhat lower. Many students enter the open-access community colleges after passing through the elementary and secondary schools without learning the basic skills.

Programs for these students are usually separately organized and are among the more controversial of community college functions because they attempt to remedy defects that were supposed to have been accommodated in other publicly supported educational structures. People frequently question why they should pay repeatedly for the attempt to teach the same skills to the same population. And the educators themselves sometimes question the presence of these programs in a collegiate institution.

Adult basic education is less controversial because it is organized and funded apart from the academic programs. In these programs students who have dropped out of high school are offered the chance to complete the courses that will enable them to attain a high school diploma or General Educational Development certificate.

Education for the handicapped includes special courses, programs, and services for students whose handicaps may be visual, auditory, physical, or psychological. These programs were given a great impetus by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and subsequent infusions of state and federal funds. Some controversy accompanies the programs as, for example, when a deaf student petitioned to enter the nursing program at Southeastern Community College and, upon being refused, petitioned the courts. A U.S. Supreme Court ruling held that the college was within its rights to deny access to the student because the Rehabilitation Act and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 did not demand that a student be admitted to any program, even one in which, in this case, patient safety might be jeopardized (Kaplin, 1985).

English as a Second Language has grown in the past 20 years along with more liberal U.S. immigration policies. In 1975 ESL was offered in one-fourth of American community colleges; in 1991, 40 percent of the colleges provided these courses. Enrollment in scheduled, credit-bearing ESL courses reached 225,000 in 1991, up fivefold since 1978 (Cohen and Ignash, 1992). By the latter year it accounted for more than half of all foreign language instruction.

The intractable problems presented by under-prepared students have become so prominent in recent years that state mandates for the community colleges to provide services for them have become widespread. California, New Jersey, and Texas are among those with specific legislation requiring community colleges to assess their entrants and place into remedial courses those who are found not qualified to participate in the college-level programs. These assessment efforts have found massive numbers of students needing remediation. A Texas statewide study found 40 percent of the students needing remedial reading and writing (Skinner and Carter, 1987). Many single-college studies have found similar or higher percentages. More than 40 percent of the entering students at Rockland Community College are directed to the developmental studies department (Brown and others, 1989) and 88 percent of the first-time students entering Shelby State Community College were placed in remedial and developmental studies courses (Hobbs, 1988). Florida's College Level Academic Skills Testing Program has made it obligatory that students pass reading, writing, and mathematics tests before being allowed to progress to the junior level of the state's public universities. Every time that a college or a state mandates assessment of incoming students, the remedial enrollments increase markedly.

Nonetheless, it is difficult to determine just how many students are engaged with all forms of developmental education. In many colleges the various types of developmental studies are not separately organized but may be merged with the regular college programs. Separate funding channels for handicapped students or for adult basic education may isolate those areas, but pre-transfer and remedial distinctions are not as easily made. One definition sometimes offered is to count as remedial any English, math, science, or social science course for which college graduation credit is not offered. Nationwide, around 30 percent of the scheduled, credit-bearing English classes and 16 percent of the math classes are designated as remedial, but this does not include the time that students spend in math and writing laboratories and learning resource centers that may not require students to attend at specific hours. Furthermore, remedial courses can be counted toward graduation in some applications, hence that distinction breaks down. Adult basic education that was formerly provided by the local school district may be adopted by the local community college and vice versa. ESL enrollments may or may not be counted as remedial. Lombardi reported that developmental education accounted for "10 to 15 percent of the total college enrollment" in the 1970s and predicted a decrease if the colleges tightened their admissions requirements, but more likely, an increase, perhaps to "50 percent within the next decade." The current figure certainly has not risen to 50 percent; except for the massive ESL effort it is probably not more than a few percentage points greater than it was. But because the term "college level" is not stable or precise, "less than college level" enrollments cannot be determined reliably.

Several controversies continually swirl around developmental education. Which students should go into which type of developmental study? What types of assessment should be used? What minimal scores are acceptable? Should placement be mandatory or volitional? Should the students be mainstreamed or segregated? Should graduation credit be offered? What type of instruction should be presented? What effects do the courses and programs have on student retention, subsequent course grades, and graduation?

These questions are discussed repeatedly in several journals, including the *Journal of Developmental Education* and the *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, devoted exclusively to this function, and articles about it appear in all of the journals addressed to community college educators. Studies of mandatory versus volitional enrollment are often reported. A Michigan study found nearly 50 percent of that state's colleges with mandatory placement in writing, 45 percent in reading, 34 percent in mathematics, and 10 percent in English as a Second Language (Argumedo, 1989). Failing mandatory placement, many students choose not to enter the developmental programs even when they are tested and advised that their academic skills fall below the norm. A study done at Oxnard College found 79 percent of the first-time students scoring below college level in writing, but only half of the group subsequently enrolled in the college's remedial writing program (Jones and Jackson, 1991). In general, there has been a recent tilt toward mandatory placement, especially in states where assessment is mandatory.

Whether or not degree credit should be awarded for remedial course work is continually debated. Nearly half the colleges in Michigan awarded full degree credit and one-fourth of them gave limited credit (Argumedo, 1989). But only three Texas colleges granted degree credit for remedial reading or mathematics, and seven awarded degree credit for remedial writing (Skinner and Carter, 1987). The tendency generally is toward graduation credit for pre-transfer but not for developmental courses; it depends on the level of the instruction, how proximate it is to what the college defines as college-level. Where credit is awarded, the students receiving associate degrees have considerably more than the minimum number of courses on their transcript.

Studies of developmental education often center on the effects of various configurations, such as segregation versus mainstreaming or traditional instruction versus learning laboratory-centered programs. The dependent variables usually are retention, grades and subsequent courses, and graduation rates. A study at Broward Community College found combined persistence and graduation rates among students who scored below college level in reading, writing, and mathematics to be highest among those who completed at least three college preparatory classes (Gabe, 1989). Students who took advantage of tutorial services at Los Medanos College were more likely to earn higher course grades and complete their classes (MacDonald, 1987). A California statewide study found that students who participated in services especially designed for matriculants with low entering skills achieved higher grades and were more likely to persist in college (Scott-Skillman and Halliday, 1991). In general, when students are left to their own volition, relatively few participate in remedial activities, but when they are barred from taking college-level courses or strongly urged to take advantage of the services for them, they tend to do better.

Although pre-transfer studies are still typically sustained through the academic departments and taught by the regular faculty, much of developmental education has moved toward separate program organization with a separate faculty, often comprised of former English teachers or counselors, many with secondary school experience. Some of the most innovative instruction in the colleges occurs in these settings because the instructors know that traditional methods have not succeeded (their students' surviving twelve years of schooling without learning to read evidenced that) and because they have nothing to lose. The faculty in the academic discipline-based departments have already written them out for betraying the foundations of the disciplines by attempting to teach students the basic skills without adhering to the traditional sources and textbooks. Accordingly, the instructors have formed their own professional associations: the College Reading and Learning Association, the National Association for Developmental Education, and the Illinois Association for Personalized Learning Programs are among the standouts. Most of these instructors have been involved with supervising tutors, paraprofessional aides, and readers. In short, they function more as managers of learning teams than as instructors isolated in classrooms. They have denied some of the discipline-based instructors' most cherished premises, especially the one saying that true instruction can only occur in a classroom with one instructor, a small group of students, a chalkboard, and a closed door. Instead, the developmental educators are more likely to attend to the discipline of instruction, making it the content of their new instructional forms.

Remedial and developmental education have a long future ahead of them because the need for literacy becomes greater as the world moves toward information transmittal and processing as a major resource. This is not to say that all students must learn to read the Great Books, but there is an immense distance between the Great Books on one hand and functional illiteracy on the other. Students need to learn not just to pronounce the words, but also to employ figures of speech and to associate communications with the context in which they were drawn and to which they are directed.

Questions of accountability or effect will continue to be raised, more with developmental study than with traditional college-level instruction, because the developmental educators have measurable goals for their students: staying in school, passing the criterion tests in the three "Rs;" progressing into and passing the college-level courses; whereas if a student does not learn history or biology in a college course, no one knows but the instructor and the grade sheet. However, the definition of literacy as the ability to function in context must always lead to variant outcomes because of the numerous contexts in which the students function while in school and in their external environment.

Transfer

Pre-baccalaureate study has been a major function of the community colleges since they were established. Hence, the number of students beginning in a community college and moving on to the universities has always been used as one measure of institutional productivity. Lombardi's comments about the decline of transfer education must be read as an observation on the lower *percentage* of community college students moving on to universities, not as a report on lower absolute numbers. As more students were stopping into the institutions for only a few courses on their way toward job entry, and as the colleges expanded into the non-traditional areas of short cycle, university extension-type presentations, the transfer ratio diminished. Also contributing to its decline was the expansion in the number of students entering the community colleges in the 1970s who did not have the literacy skills sufficient to enable them to pursue a collegiate program.

Much of the commentary about transfer numbers has been based on gross figures, general estimates, and scattered data. The statistics were not comparable between states, and the absence of a standard way of calculating transfer rates limited the precision with which estimates could be made. There were no reliable national studies, and the few state and institutional studies that were available yielded conclusions as diverse as the definitions and data on which they were based. Lombardi noted that the percentage of students transferring "ranges between two and 30," the percentage of community college graduates who transfer is "between 45 percent and 75 percent," and the total enrollment divided into the number of transfers in California and Washington yielded an "average of three to five percent."

Whether or not transfer numbers have changed in the past 15 years is uncertain because of the incomparability of the numbers. However, in an effort to stabilize the data and definitions, the Center for the Study of Community Colleges embarked on a Ford Foundation-sponsored project in 1989 to study transfer nationwide (Cohen, 1991). The first three years of that project yielded numbers that tended to bear out Lombardi's analyses. Using the definition of transfer rate as "The number of students who enter the community college with no prior college experience and obtain 12 units at the college, divided into the number of that group who matriculate at a four-year college or university within four years," the Center staff found that around half the students who enter complete 12 units in four years, and of those who do, 23 percent transfer. This results in a transfer rate of between 11 and 12 percent of the entrants. The range between institutions is predictably high: from 2 to 77 percent of the 12-unit recipients. Lombardi's estimate was modest, but as he noted, colleges in states that had open admission, such as California; states where the community colleges are designed to provide occupational studies almost exclusively, such as South Carolina; colleges in remote areas where a senior institution is not within commuting distance; and those where ill-prepared students form a sizable proportion of the population, have exceedingly low transfer rates. The colleges with high proportions of full-time students, those operating in the shadow of senior institutions where program articulation has been vigorously pursued, and those where the surrounding population is of high-income families with a tradition of college going have much higher transfer rates.

Lombardi contended that transfer studies would continue to decline as the community colleges took on the adult and vocational education that was formerly assigned to adult schools attached to the public school districts and to other agencies such as police academies, banking institutes, and hospital-based health service training programs. Transfer would also decline where the colleges "have a very high proportion of part-time and older students; have a low selective admission policy; and have a high minority population." He saw the colleges continuing to offer the liberal arts and to effect vocationally related transfer programs, "but the enrollees in the courses will include more than formerly those who do not want, are not capable of, or cannot sustain the regimen of a two- or three-year sequence."

The future for the transfer function is not as grim as Lombardi thought. Occupational studies and community services notwithstanding, the public, the potential students, and the legislatures still see the colleges as the points of first entry to higher education for sizable numbers of students who would otherwise never progress past high school. State and national data mask the variation among the colleges. The community colleges are neighborhood schools and the types of students attending them have a marked effect on their outcomes. Even though the availability of funds that students may use in any type of college has made it possible for many prospective students to pay the higher tuition in the senior institutions, the community colleges are still attractive to those who must support or be sustained by their families while they are attending school. Coupled with their ease of entry, exit, and re-entry, and the possibilities for part-time attendance, the community colleges retain their allure. Those who deplore the colleges' ability to propel all their matriculants toward the baccalaureate keep bumping into the reality of their appeal to the widest variety of students, student abilities, and student aspirations.

However, even though the transfer function is not in jeopardy, few prominent community college leaders articulate its virtues. Lombardi deplored those who derided it in their hope that new promises of direct community uplift would bring the public support that they craved: "Sometimes one wonders if community college educators are being enticed toward other areas . . . because they fear failure in the transfer function, or because in community education areas accountability is not a problem." Feelings of inadequacy can lead either to massive efforts to overcome the problem or to attempts to change the bases on which judgments are presumably made.

Many college leaders seem fearful of any measure by which their institution might be held to account. Most of them probably value transfer study no more or less than occupational training or literacy development. They simply hold an aversion to data on transfer or any other institutional outcome that they cannot ignore when legislators or reporters confront them with definitive numbers. Recent moves toward state- and federal-level accountability have not led many of them to adopt or develop valid productivity measures. Instead, they seem to have attempted to shun the statistics and to hope that the funding agencies and the commentators will eventually stop asking what they perceive to be the wrong kinds of questions.

Community Services

Always persistent but never co-equal with the transfer and vocational functions, community service continues somewhere on the periphery. Adult or continuing education is part of it, along with community support activities, adult basic literacy development, and an array of cultural, recreational, and human support services provided to members of the community who are not enrolled in the traditional liberal arts and occupational programs. It falls short of what its most ardent supporters have claimed for it, but it succeeds notably in specific applications. Taken as a whole, it is less than the sum of its parts.

During the time that Lombardi was writing, community services was being promoted vigorously by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., then president of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Using his bully pulpit, Gleazer argued continually for the college to be the nexus of all community educative activities, to be the agency that uplifts its community directly by intervening in every aspect of community life, to reach out beyond the campus and touch the citizenry with an array of forums, fairs, and resource centers accessible to everyone. It was to be the vehicle for building communities, solving community problems, bringing people together harmoniously.

Gleazer was not alone in promoting community services as a integral part of the community college mission. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation has sustained a continuing commitment to community services, funding projects designed to promote the concept and the activities sustained under it. Beginning in the 1960s, the foundation put funds into national workshops, studies, and numerous activities coordinated by regional centers. Most recently it has provided a sizable grant to North Carolina State University to promote community services in four eastern states. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has also supported community services-related projects. One of their efforts resulted in the widely circulated monograph entitled *Building Communities* (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988). The Ford Foundation has funded projects designed to link community agencies with the community colleges of the area. A National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education has been active since the 1960s, serving as a forum for practitioners interested in the concept. Community service is part of the community college mission, not nearly as well known as the primary functions, but nonetheless durable.

Although adult basic education is often listed as a component of community services, it has a separate identity. Frequently centered on basic skills development for functionally illiterate adults, adult basic education has been provided by community colleges in areas where that function is not well coordinated by the lower schools. A study of adult basic education in Washington community colleges (Seppanen, 1991) found that most of the students who had been enrolled in programs designed to make up high school deficiencies cited personal interest goals for themselves. They suggested they wanted to feel better about themselves, to earn more money, to change their lives for the better. Like university extension divisions but with a less formally educated clientele, community college adult or non-credit instruction seeks to make people better by providing them with what they need at the time in their life that they need it.

Lombardi commented on continuing education as a part of community services and predicted that as people have more leisure time, a strong trend toward providing adult education under the banner of community service develops. And indeed, some forms of continuing education have become prominent, with basic literacy development only one of them. Other forms of extensively provided continuing education include short-term workshops for people with special problems such as alcohol or drug dependency, special short courses in interviewing for jobs, taking care of children or aged parents, and coping with major life changes. These sessions, frequently as short as a few hours but sometimes extending over several weeks, are offered sporadically, usually only when specially generated extramural funding can be found for them. The distinctions between what may be offered for credit and thus reimbursed by the state and what must be funded separately have never been clearly drawn, but as state funds become more difficult to obtain, the restrictions become more stringent.

A review of the various activities conducted under the heading of continuing education or community services reveals little change in scope over the past decades. Many of the colleges have obtained funds from state agencies for economic development which they use to attract industries to their region by securing tax abatements, assisting the industries in finding suitable sites, and providing training for the workers, all in one package. Many of them offer job fairs in an attempt to connect people who need jobs with businesses that need people; health fairs that provide tips on personal care; recreational activities in senior citizens' centers; small business and family farm advising; community use of the colleges' physical education facilities; community forums; contract education for industry; and numerous cultural activities, including art, music, dance, and theater programs open to everyone. Although efforts have been made to involve full-time faculty members in providing these activities, in most cases they are coordinated by a community services director who finds talent that usually is not otherwise affiliated with the college. Funding for these activities is derived ad hoc; the community services director usually functions with a budget sufficient only to maintain the coordinating office.

Community service is strongest where it fills an educational gap not being accommodated by other institutions. The most successful sustained programs have taken place in rural areas where the college is the central agency for coordinating direct service to the region. Here is where the craft fairs and cultural events thrive because few other institutions provide those types of services. Where the notion of the community college as an agency coordinating other community agencies breaks down is in the large cities which have well established civic and charitable organizations of their own.

Lombardi was skeptical, not so much of the community service concept but of the rhetoric that was being used to promote it. He believed that students appeared each year who must be taught computation, comprehension, and analysis, the traditional spheres of learning. He felt that the colleges' main job was formal education, that they should stick to business and not rush about seeking new areas of service. "Education is our mission, our reason for existence. Our regular collegiate programs . . . must not be transformed, subordinated or eliminated. . . . Responsibility for problem solving rests with the community leaders." Regarding the extravagant claims about the community colleges serving all community needs, he said, "I must assume that the statement is just hyperbole."

The rhetoric continues, probably because each service area in the institution has a corps of supporters who feel they must continually laud the function lest it be forgotten or set aside in favor of the traditional functions. However, the proponents of community services continue to operate apart from the regular college programs, rarely attempting to integrate their concerns with the credit courses and the students and faculty who populate them. For example, those who are concerned with building community might well sustain a continuing effort to encourage civic education in the regular courses. They could insist on internships for students to work in community agencies. They could argue that all regularly enrolled students should serve a period of community service. They could try to get the sociology department to conduct community surveys, the health-related classes to place their students as interns in nursing homes and clinics, the psychology students to serve for a minimum number of hours in mental-health facilities. These types of activities do happen but they are not nearly as well coordinated as they might be.

The future for community services is stable. Little bodes to change it. The shorter worker week that would provide people with more time to pursue education has not materialized. The self-directed part-time scholar is as rare now as ever. People are more likely to spend their leisure time in playing games than in self-renewal or in the type of civic activity that would build community.

Community services do provide a service, but it is limited. The fanciful dream of the community college as the hub of a region's direct-service activities has not been realized. As a devoted but realistic supporter of the function commented, "It is ironic that the area of the community college mission that makes our colleges unique . . . has been the stepchild of the community college movement (Cavan, 1989, p. 9)." Somehow, community service agencies stubbornly resist efforts to coordinate them, and communities seem never to want to be built. It follows that an activity that is not integrated with the core functions of providing job entry skill training, career upgrading, and transfer and general education has little chance to move to a prominent place.

Student Activism

The student activism that was prevalent on university campuses in the United States, France, Japan, and elsewhere in the 1960s was never as prominent in the American community colleges. The colleges did have their share of anti-war protests, but most of the activism was centered on intramural concerns such as student demands for additional financial aid and objections to the way schedules were drawn or instructors were assigned. Protest organized around major social issues was rare.

Community college student activism has centered for the most part on student attempts to be free of restrictive rules on their conduct. Student newspapers have always been a problem, especially when some editor or staff writer decides to test the boundaries by printing a provocative article, story, or poem. The college's right to guide student conduct thereupon comes into conflict with First Amendment rules governing freedom of the press, and these cases are sometimes taken up by the greater student body as evidence of how the school administration tends to treat them as children. Ethnically oriented student groups have also demonstrated occasionally at community colleges on behalf of additional minority instructors or more attention to minority concerns in the curriculum. Students have also petitioned, sometimes vociferously, for participation in college governance. But in all these cases the activism has not reached the level of disruption that it has sometimes taken at the universities.

Lombardi was attentive to the community college student activism of the late 1960s and early 1970s, not so much because he was sympathetic with much of what the students were demanding, but because he was fascinated by the way that many administrators reacted to the demands. His own values centered on the expectation of human frailty and the importance of individual independence and self-reliance. He saw the student activists as adults who in many cases were making mistakes in the ferocity and vociferousness of their actions. But that did not give the administrators a license to overmanage the situations. He disdained the administrators who thought they could intervene with the students or the faculty down to levels of minute behavior, particularly those who thought they could suspend students or fire instructors. He recognized the limits on leadership and saw students and faculty as people deserving understanding, not as wards in need of behavior control.

The recent flurry of speech code adoption on many university campuses evidences administrator reaction to different forms of activism. Students denounce what they see as racism and discrimination exhibited in campus newspapers, signs, graffiti, and deliberately provocative face-to-face remarks. But few community colleges have found it necessary to push through speech codes; they seem better able to allow the due processes of community rules to operate. Many of the universities still cling to the *in loco parentis* concept while in the community colleges the leaders understand that they are not operating sequestered, residential institutions but rather educational structures for adult members of the community. And rightly so, because if an institution where adult members of the community spend a few hours a week attempted to function as a full-care facility for adolescents, it would appear anomalous indeed.

Summary

This chapter has brought some of Lombardi's ideas and beliefs into a more contemporary context. Much of what he observed has changed little in the 15 to 20 years since he wrote. Even though most of the students attend intermittently or "incidentally," as Adelman (1992) put it, whether they take five courses per semester or one course every five semesters, they still must be taught. The community colleges are the point of first entry to higher education for many people who otherwise would never enroll. They will never overturn the class structure in American society, but as long as they function as they do, they will offer individuals the opportunity of moving out of the class into which they were born, of progressing on their own merits.

Lombardi recognized these characteristics of the institutions, and as a long-term administrator he appreciated the possibilities of the institution and the people within it. Much of his writing seems as though he was patronizing the people to whom he was speaking, but if he did seem avuncular or paternalistic, it was not in the sense of an uncle who gives advice from afar or a father who stifles, but as a leader who allows freedom, expects error, offers guidance, and forgives his constituents. By contrast, much of the contemporary management-by-consensus, by consulting the contracts which may offer contradictory rules, and by the *anomic impedimenta* of massive bureaucracies seems a pale substitute.

The community college has found its niche in postcompulsory education in the United States. Other nations sometimes provide the same services through a combination of institutions, but more often they do not use the formal school system to coordinate the various services provided in the American community colleges. The American experiment of offering access to higher education, job entry, job up-grading, literacy development, and continuing education all within the same institution has not been duplicated elsewhere.

The community colleges are still struggling for recognition, still blessed with sizable numbers of responsible educators, still assailed from within by ostensible spokespersons who make claims that can never be realized and from without by commentators who do not understand what they are trying to accomplish. The critics who point to the colleges' inability to propel all the matriculants toward bachelor's degrees miss the essence of the institution. The hyperbolists err on the other side. Lombardi would have admonished, guided, and then forgiven them all.

References

Adelman, C. (1992). *The Way We Are—The Community College as American Thermometer*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education.

Argumedo, B. J. (1989). *A Survey of Student Assessment and Remedial/Developmental Education in Michigan's Public Community Colleges*, 146 pp. Lansing, MI: Michigan State Department of Education Community College Services Unit. (ED 307 002)

Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900–1985*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brown, J. R., & Others. (1989). *Developmental Studies Department Special Services Project: Rockland Community College, 1988-1989*, 85 pp. Suffern, NY: Rockland Community College. (ED 319 427)

California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor. (1989a). *Report on Staffing and Salaries, Fall 1989*, 80 pp. Sacramento: Author. (ED 324 055)

California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor. (1987). *Study of Part-Time Instruction*, 80 pp. Sacramento: Author. (ED 278 449)

California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor. (1989b). *Trends and Comparisons in Community College Staffing*, 14 pp. Sacramento: Author. (ED 321 815)

Cavan, J. J. (1989). "A Futuristic, Visionary Approach that Looks at the Policy Statement of the National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education." *Community Services Catalyst, 19*(3), 9–11.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1989). *The American Community College* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Cohen, A. M. (1991). "Building Indicators of Community College Outcomes," 10 pp. Unpublished manuscript. (ED 338 298)

Cohen, A. M., & Ignash, J. (1992). "Trends in the Liberal Arts Curriculum." *Community College Review, 20*(2).

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. (1988). *Building Communities: A Vision for A New Century. A Report of the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Eaton, Judith (Ed.). (1992). *Financing Nontraditional Students. A Seminar Report*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Elliott, L. C. (1983). "The Legal Ramifications of Proper Instruction: Some Considerations for Division Heads in Community Colleges." *Community College Review, 11*(1), 3–12.

Gabe, L. C. (1989). "College Preparatory Instruction and Student Persistence at Broward Community College." *Institutional Research Report Abstract RR89-14*, 8 pp. Fort Lauderdale, FL: Broward Community College. (ED 309 822)

Grubb, W. N. (1988). "Vocationalizing Higher Education: The Causes of Enrollment and Completion in Public Two-Year Colleges, 1970–1980." *Economics of Education Review*, *7*(3), 301-319.

Hammons, J. (1984). "The Department/Division Chairperson: Education Leader?" *Community and Junior College Journal*, *54*(6), 14–19.

Hobbs, R. L. (Comp.). (1988). *Academic and Developmental Services End of Year Status Report, 1987-88: Shelby State Community College*, 116 pp. Memphis, TN: Shelby State Community College. (ED 305 111)

Illinois Community College Board. (1991). *Fall 1990 Salary Survey Report for the Illinois Public Community Colleges*. Springfield, IL: Author. (ED 327 243)

Jones, J., & Jackson, R. (1991). *The Impact of Writing Placement Testing and Remedial Writing Programs on Student Ethnic Populations at Oxnard College*, 18 pp. Research Report #91-02. Oxnard, CA: Oxnard College. (ED 335 081)

Kaplin, W. A. (1985). *The Law of Higher Education*. Second Edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Katsinas, S. G., & Lacey, V. A. (1989). *Community Colleges and Economic Development: Models of Institutional Effectiveness*, 97 pp. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ED 312 006)

MacDonald, R. B. (April 20-24, 1987). "Evaluation of an Alternative Solution for the Assessment and Retention of High-Risk College Students," 40 pp. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ED 316 302)

McKinney, T. H., & Davis, D. A. (1988). "Patterns of Funding in Vocational Education." *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal*, *58*(5), 44–47.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1991a). *Current Funds, Revenues, and Expenditures, Report No. 91-219*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1991b). *Digest of Education Statistics, 1991. Report No. 91-697*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1992). *National Higher Education Statistics: Fall 1991. Report No. 92-038*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Education Association. (1989a). *Selected Collective Bargaining Agreements of Michigan Two-Year Colleges*, 531 pp. Washington, DC: Author. (ED 322 947)

National Education Association. (1989b). *Selected Collective Bargaining Agreements of Florida Two-Year Colleges. Broward Community College, Fort Lauderdale, and Indian River Community College*, 120 pp. Washington, DC: Author. (ED 321 821)

National Education Association. (1989c). *Selected Collective Bargaining Agreements of Oregon Two-Year Colleges*, 342 pp. Washington, DC: Author. (ED 321 974)

National Education Association. (1989d). *Selected Collective Bargaining Agreements of Pennsylvania Two-Year Colleges*, 135 pp. Washington, DC: Author. (ED 322 949)

Palmer, J. C. "The Characteristics and Educational Objectives of Students Served by Community College Vocational Curricula." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, 1987.

Palmer, J. C. (1990). *How Do Community Colleges Serve Business and Industry? A Review of Issues Discussed in the Literature*, 62 pp. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ED 319 443)

Parsons, M. H. (October 11, 1989). "The Past as Prologue: Variables Influencing the Continuing Development of Community Services in America's Community Colleges," 10 pp. Paper presented at the 20th Annual Conference of the National Council on Community Services and Continuing Education, Pensacola, Florida. (ED 314 103)

Portolan, Janet S. (1992). "Developing a Statewide Organization for Instructional Administrators in California Community Colleges." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles.

Scott, J. H. (1990). "Role of Community College Department Chairs in Faculty Development." *Community College Review*, *18*(3), 12–16.

Scott-Skillman, T., & Halliday, K. (1991). *Matriculation: A Report on Third-Year Implementation, 1989–90*, 92 pp. Sacramento: California Community Colleges Board of Governors. (ED 329 315)

Seppanen, L. (1991). *Adult Basic Education in Washington Community Colleges: A Follow-up Study*, 31 pp. Olympia, WA: Washington State Board for Community College Education. (ED 330 397)

Silvers, P. J. (1990). *Utilization of Associate Faculty at Pima Community College: A Report on Surveys of College Associate Faculty and Department Heads*, 32 pp. Tucson, AZ: Pima Community College. (ED 329 320)

Skinner, E. F., & Carter, S. (1987). *Texas Association of Junior and Community College Instructional Administrators Remedial Education Study*, 34 pp. Tempe, AZ: National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance. (ED 291 416)

Skinner, E. F., & Carter, S. (1987). *A Second Chance for Texans: Remedial Education in Two-Year Colleges*, 26 pp. Tempe, AZ: National Center for Postsecondary Governance and Finance. (ED 297 783)

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. (1991). "Board Adopts New Policy: Performance Tied to Approval of New Associate Degrees." *CB Report*, *26*(3), 2.

Wepner, G. (1987). "Evaluation of a Postsecondary Remedial Mathematics Program." *Journal of Developmental Education*, *11*(1), 6–9.

Winner, C. N. (1989). "The Role and Function of the Departmental Chairperson at Delaware Technical and Community College," 159 pp. Unpublished manuscript. (ED 308 98)

Zeiss, T. (Ed.). (1991). *Creating a Literate Society: College-Business-Community Partnerships*, 90 pp. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ED 331 546)

Comprehensive Lombardi Bibliography

This list excludes about one hundred speeches, presentations, reports, and ephemera that exist in typescript. Many of the themes appearing in the excluded items reappear in more formal form in the included items.

Lombardi, J. (December 1934). "Gothic Cathedrals." *Newman News*, *19*(1), 5, 10, 13. (Newman Club, University of California at Los Angeles.)

Lombardi, J. (December 1937). "Lost Records of the Surveyor-General in California." *The Pacific Historical Review*, *6*(4), 361–371.

Lombardi, J. (1939). "Press and Radio as Channels of Influence." *Propaganda: The War for Men's Minds*. Los Angeles: Los Angeles City College Press, 27–37.

Lombardi, J. (1942). *Labor's Voice in the Cabinet: A History of the Department of Labor from its Origin to 1921*. New York: Columbia University Press, 370 pp. Reprinted by AMS Press, Inc., New York, 1968.

Lombardi, J. (April 1942). "Mobilizing Labor in 1917 and 1918." *Progress—Bulletin*. Los Angeles: College Press, Los Angeles City College, *1*(1), 5–18.

Lombardi, J. (May 1944). "Service Schools Teach Us Many Lessons." *California Journal of Secondary Education, 19*(4), 230–233. University of California, Berkeley.

Lombardi, J. (November 21, 1949). "What is a Junior College?" *The Los Angeles School Journal, 33*(5), 14, 24.

Lombardi, J. (May 1951). "For Every Youth, Two Years of College." *The Nation's Schools, 47*(5), 38–40.

Lombardi, J., & Trigg, C. W. (February 1951). "Classroom Utilization on an Overcrowded Campus." *Junior College Journal, 21*(6), 337–340.

Lombardi, J. (April 14, 1951). "Vocational Education in the Junior College." *School and Society, 73*(1895), 225–228.

Lombardi, J. (December 1952). "Informing the Public about the Philosophy of the Junior College." *Junior College Journal, 23*(4), 215–218.

Lombardi, J. (November 1952). "Is the Place of the Junior College Assured?" *California Journal of Secondary Education, 27*(7), 394–396.

Committee to Study the All-Year School. (July 1954). *The All-Year School*. A Report by the Committee to Study the All-Year School, Los Angeles City School Districts, 81 pp. (John Lombardi represented the Junior Colleges on the 13-member committee.)

Lombardi, J. (September 10, 1955). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, Director, 13 pp.

Lombardi, J. (September 14, 1956). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, Director, 19 pp.

Lombardi, J. (September 13, 1957). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, Director, 23 pp.

Lombardi, J. (September 12, 1958). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, Director, 27 pp.

Lombardi, J. (May 1959). "Mathematics in California Secondary Schools." *The California Mathematics Council, 17*(1), 3–6.

Lombardi, J. (September 11, 1959). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, President, 13 pp.

Lombardi, J. (December 1960). "Articulation Conference." *The Courier, 7*(3), 2–3.

Lombardi, J. (September 10, 1960). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, President, 14 pp.

Lombardi, J. (September 9, 1961). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, President, 17 pp.

Lombardi, J. (January 25, 1962). "The Aministrative Philosophy of the Los Angeles Colleges." *College Philosophy and Organization: A Report to the Board of Education*, 4–6.

Lombardi, J. (June 1962). "The Los Angeles Study of Year-Round Operation." *Theory Into Practice*, *1*(3), 131–135.

Lombardi, J. (September 14, 1962). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, President, 14 pp.

Lombardi, J. (September 13, 1963). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, President, 19 pp.

Lombardi, J. (November 15–17, 1964). "The Effect of Separating Junior Colleges from the Secondary School System." A Working Paper Prepared for the Seminar on Issues Affecting the Junior Colleges. Coordinating Council for Higher Education, typescript, 17 pp.

Lombardi, J. (May 11–12, 1964). "Emergent Issues in Junior College Administration." *Emergent Issues in Community College Administration in Our Changing Society*. Conference sponsored by Coordinating Committee, California Leadership Program, University of Washington, Washington State University. Seattle: University of Washington, pp. 36–46.

Lombardi, J. (November 1964). "Emergent Issues in Administration." *Junior College Journal*, *35*(3), 4–8.

Lombardi, J. (1964). Letter to editor of *Junior College Journal*, May 1964. On issues of faculty-administrator relationships referencing an article by Bill J. Priest in the March 1964 issue of *Junior College Journal*.

Lombardi, J. (Spring 1964). "Occupational Education in California Junior Colleges." *The Educational Record*, *45*(2), 142–147.

Lombardi, J. (April 7, 1964). "The Roles of the Junior Colleges in the Education of Teachers: A Report of the State Committee on Continuing Education." *CCME*, 28 pp.

Lombardi, J. (September 11, 1964). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, President, 21 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1965). "The California Articulation Conference." *Foreign Language News Notes*, *3*(8), 1. First published in the "Proceedings" of the Junior College Articulation Panel at the Third Biennial Convention of the California Council, Foreign Language Teachers Associations, Long Beach, November 1964, pp. 4–8.

Lombardi, J. (September 10, 1965). *The State of the College*. A Report to the Faculty of Los Angeles City College by John Lombardi, President, 21 pp.

Lombardi, J. (November 1966). "Faculty in the Administrative Process." *Junior College Journal*, *37*(3), 9–16.

Lombardi, J. (April 1966). "Standards at the Grass Roots." *ALA Bulletin, 60*(4), 377–380.

Lombardi, J. (January 1966). "Theatre Arts Dedication Address," November 17, 1965. *News from Los Angeles City College*, p. 3.

Lombardi, J., & Warburton, S. T. (1966). "The Expanded Use of Data Processing Equipment in the Los Angeles Colleges, An Informational Report of the Division of College and Adult Education, Los Angeles City Schools." Los Angeles City Schools, California, 34 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1967). "The Open-Door College: A Commitment to Change." *Systems Approaches to Curriculum and Instruction in the Open-Door College*, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: UCLA. Occasional Report Number 9, Junior College Leadership Program, 9–16.

Lombardi, J. (March 1968). "California's New State Board." *Junior College Journal, 38*(6), 27–31.

Lombardi, J. (October 31, 1968). "Unique Problems of the Inner City Colleges." Presented to the California Junior College Association. Anaheim, 14 pp.

Lombardi, J. (June 18, 1969). "The Graduate in the Midst of a Revolution." Commencement Address at Los Angeles Valley College, typescript, 12 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1969). "The Junior College President and the Faculty." *The Junior College President.* A Report of a Conference Sponsored by the UCLA Junior College Leadership Program, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the California Junior College Association, the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, and the University of California Office of Relations with Schools, July 15–17, 1968, ed. B. Lamar Johnson. Los Angeles: UCLA. Occasional Report Number 13, pp. 41–55.

Lombardi, J. (1969). *Student Activism in Junior Colleges: An Administrator's Views.* Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges and American Association of Junior Colleges. Monograph Series, 74 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1969). "Unique Problems of the Inner City Colleges." *Integrated Education*, 7(3), 62–70.

Lombardi, J. (September 1970). *The Position Papers of Black Student Activists.* Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges Topical Paper No. 12, 16 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1971). "Black Studies as a Curriculum Catalyst." Chapter in Arthur M. Cohen et al., *A Constant Variable: New Perspectives on the Community College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., pp. 157–175.

Lombardi, J. (1971). *Black Studies in the Community College.* Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges and American Association of Junior Colleges, Monograph No. 13.

Lombardi, J. (January 1971). *The President's Reaction to Black Student Activism.* Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 16, 29 pp.

Lombardi, J., & Quimby, E. A. (May 1971). *Black Studies as a Curriculum Catalyst.* Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 22, 19 pp.

Lombardi, J., & Quimby, E. A. (1971). *Black Studies in Community Colleges.* National Center for Educational Communication. Washington, DC: Office of Education. Washington, DC, 37 pp.

Lombardi, J., & Quimby, E. A. (1971). "Black Studies in the Community Colleges: A Survey, Final Report." University of California, Los Angeles, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 89 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1971). "Vocational Education." Chapter in Arthur M. Cohen et al., A *Constant Variable: New Perspectives on the Community College.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., pp. 137–156.

Lombardi, J. (1972). "Tuition and the Open Door." *Junior College Journal, 42*(8), 8–11.

Lombardi, J. (February 1972). *The Financial Crisis in the Community College.* Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 29, 31 pp.

Lombardi, J. (May 1972). "Moratorium on New Junior Colleges." *Junior College Research Review* (ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, UCLA), *6*(9), 1–3.

Lombardi, J. (October 1972). "Prospects for Middle Management." Community Colleges supplement to *Change, 4*(8), 32a–32d.

Lombardi, J. (October 1972). "Who Speaks for the Junior Colleges in California?" ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, typescript, 17 pp.

Lombardi, J. (April 1973). "The Chairman in the Midst of a Revolution." *Role of the Department/Division Chairman in the Community College.* Report from the Community Junior College Program. Sam Houston State University, Junior College Graduate Program, ed. John R. Grable, 33–38.

Lombardi, J. (1973). "College Without Walls is Exciting News on the American Scene." *American Schools News,* First Quarter.

Lombardi, J. (Summer 1973). "Critical Decade for Community College Financing." *New Directions for Community Colleges, 1*(2).

Lombardi, J. (December 1973). *The Department/Division Structure in the Community College.* Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 38, 20 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1973). *Managing Finances in Community Colleges*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 145 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1973). *Meeting the Financial Crisis, New Directions for Community Colleges*, ed. Arthur M. Cohen; Issue Editor, John Lombardi. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., No. 2, Summer, 136 pp. Includes: Editor's Notes by J. Lombardi.

Lombardi, J. (March 1973). "A New Look at Vocational Education," *Change* (Community College supplement), *5*(2), pp. 32a–32g.

Lombardi, J. (April 1973). "Role of the Department Chairman in Improving Community College Instruction." *Role of the Department/Division Chairman in the Community College*, Report from the Community Junior College Program, Sam Houston State University, Junior College Graduate Program, ed. John R. Grable, pp. 7–12.

Lombardi, J. (Summer 1974). "The Community College Departmental Structure—Directions for the Future." *Community College Review*, *2*(2), pp. 33–40.

Lombardi, J. (May 1974). *The Department/Division Chairman: Characteristics and Role in the Community College*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 40, 22 pp.

Lombardi, J. (March 1974). *The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in Community Colleges*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 39, 21 pp.

Lombardi, J. (October 1974). *Faculty Workload*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 46, 23 pp.

Lombardi, J. (February 24–28, 1974). "Implications for Community College Governance Under Collective Bargaining." ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, UCLA. Prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, "Collective Bargaining in the Community College, Alpha or Omega," UCLA, 16 pp.

Lombardi, J. (April 18, 1974). "The Next Ten Years." ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, UCLA, Spring Seminar Program, Association of Community College Trustees, Anaheim, CA, typescript, 15 pp.

Lombardi, J. (December 1974). *Reduction in Force: An Analysis of the Policies and Their Implementation*. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 48, 32 pp.

Lombardi, J. (Winter 1974). "When Faculties are Reduced." ERIC Community Colleges Column in *Change*, *6*(10), 55–56.

Lombardi, J. (1975). "Collective Bargaining Impinges on Management," *College Responses to Community Demands*, Arthur M. Cohen and Associates, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 12–23.

Lombardi, J. comp. (1975). "Excerpts on Selected Topics in Collective Bargaining Agreements and a Brief Review of the Status of Collective Bargaining in Community Colleges, 1972 to 1975; an ERIC Brief." UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 29 pp. Prepared for the Advisory Committee of the UCLA Community College Leadership Program.

Lombardi, J. (1975). "Free Tuition Faces Its Doom," *College Responses to Community Demands*, Arthur M. Cohen and Associates, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 24–33.

Lombardi, J. (December 1975). *Part-Time Faculty in Community Colleges*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 54, 58 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1975). "Reduction in Force and the Seniority System," *College Responses to Community Demands*, Arthur M. Cohen and Associates, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 49–61.

Lombardi, J. (June 1975). *Riding the Wave of New Enrollments*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 50, 53 pp.

Lombardi, J. (Summer 1976). "The Myth of No-Tuition College," *Community College Review*, *4*(1), pp. 59–64.

Lombardi, J. (October 1976). *No- or Low-Tuition: A Lost Cause*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 58, 41 pp.

Lombardi, J. (January 1976). "Salaries for Part-Time Faculty: New Trends," *Community College Review*, *3*(3), pp. 77–88.

Lombardi, J. (1976). "Staff Development Programs for Part-Time Occupational-Vocational Instructors: An ERIC Brief." UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 18 pp. Prepared for the Advisory Committee of the UCLA Community College Leadership Program.

Lombardi, J. (January 26–27, 1976). "Through the Glass Darkly: The Changing Role of Community Colleges." A presentation to the First Annual Conference of the Association of California Community College Administrators, San Francisco, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, UCLA, typescript, 13 pp.

Lombardi, J. (March 1977). *Noncampus Colleges: New Governance Patterns for Outreach Programs*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 60, 74 pp.

Lombardi, J. (Winter 1977). "Update on Noncampus Colleges," An ERIC Review, *Community College Review*, *4*(3), pp. 57–64.

Lombardi, J. (Spring 1978). "Community Services: A Status Report," *The Community Services Catalyst*, pp. 14–17.

Lombardi, J. (1978). *Community Education: Threat to College Status?* Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 68, 45 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1978). "Community Education: Threat to Collegiality?" *Community College Review*, *6*(1), 40–49.

Lombardi, J. (1978). "Los Angeles City College: Past, Present, Future," ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, UCLA, nd (probably 1978–79), typescript, 12 pp.

Lombardi, J. (January 1978). *Resurgence of Occupational Education*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 65, 36 pp.

Lombardi, J. (Winter 1978). "The Surge of Occupational Education," *Community College Review*, *5*(3), 55–65.

Cohen, A. M., & Lombardi, J. (November/December 1979). "Can the Community Colleges Survive Success?" *Change*, *11*(8), pp. 24–27.

Lombardi, J. (June 1979). "Changing Administrative Relations Under Collective Bargaining," *Junior College Resource Review*, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 5 pp.

Lombardi, J. (January 1979). "Community College Financing in the Post-Proposition 13 Era," *ERIC Junior College Resource Review*, 6 pp.

Lombardi, J. (December 1979). *The Decline of Transfer Education*. Los Angeles: UCLA, ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, Topical Paper No. 70, 34 pp.

Lombardi, J. (Summer 1979). "Developmental Education: A Rapidly Expanding Function," *Community College Review*, *7*(1), 65–72.

Lombardi, J. (March 1979). "Four Phases of Developmental Education," *ERIC Junior College Resource Review*, 4 pp.

Lombardi, J. (Winter 1980-81). "The Trustee's Role in the Evaluation of the President," *Trustee Quarterly*, *5*(1), pp. 15–21.

Lombardi, J. (May 1980). "What's Happened to the Associate Degree?" *ERIC Junior College Resource Review* (ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, UCLA), 4 pp.

Lombardi, J. (1982). "Foreword," *The American Community College* by Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, ix–xii.

Lombardi, J. (1984). "The Impact of Correctional Education on Length of Incarceration: Non-Support for New Paroling Policy Motivation," *Journal of Correctional Education*, *35*(2), 54–57.

INDEX

A

Academic programs. *See* Transfer programs
Accountability, 34-35, 158, 174, 177
Activism (student), 129-149; defined, 130; and Free Speech Movement, 130-131; in junior colleges, 132-134; by groups, 134-135; and breakdown of student government, 136-137; and participation in college government, 137-139; and student rights, 139; significant documents, 139-140; and procedural due process, 140-143; assessment of, 144-147; effect on curriculum, instruction, 144-145; and charters of liberty, 145; and student emancipation, 145-147; contemporary views (1990s), 180-181
Adult education: basic programs (ABE), 17, 90, 92, 93-95, 110; and community services, 127; contemporary views (1990s), 171-173. *See also* Community education, services; Developmental education; Literacy
Advanced and professional programs. *See* Transfer programs
African-Americans. *See* Minorities
Age: and enrollments, 3, 4-5, 8, 15, 20-21, 111; and community services, 122-123; contemporary views (1990s), 152-155. *See also* Zero population growth
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 6, 177
American Association of Retired Persons, 123
American Federation of Teachers (AFT), 16
Appalachia, Southern, 8
Arizona, 11, 16, 159
Asian-Americans. *See* Minorities
Austin Community College (Texas), 8

B

Baccalaureate-oriented programs. *See* Transfer programs
Black Power, 131, 132, 147
Blacks. *See* Minorities
Branch campus, 35
Broward Community College (Ft. Lauderdale), 173

C

California: enrollments, 1, 2, 7, 14, 15; finance, 31, 32, 37; faculty workloads, 42, 48, 159, 160, 162-163; part-time teaching, 53, 58; transfer programs, 101, 102-103, 106, 107, 108, 175-176; age of students, 111; student activism, 141-143; tuition, 155-157; faculty pay, 162-163; department chairs, 165-166; developmental programs, 173
California Master Plan for Higher Education, 112
Campuses, colleges without (walls), 8, 35, 120-121
Center for the Study of Community Colleges, 175
Charles Stewart Mott Community College (Michigan), 56
Chautauqua movement, 125
Chicago City Colleges, 42, 49
Clark, Burton, 134
Class sizes, 40-43, 47, 49
Classes (social), 182
Colby Junior College (New Hampshire), 147
Collective bargaining: effect on workloads, 39, 43, 49; for part-time faculty, 54, 56, 58, 63; contemporary views (1990s), 159-60, 162, 163, 164
College: use of term, 19-20; student participation in government of, 137-139
College parallel programs. See Transfer programs
College Student Questionnaire (CSQ), 134
Colleges (four-year), competition from, 15, 110
Colorado, 80
Columbia Crisis (1968), 131

Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, 8

Community education, services: and transfer programs, 109; development, 119-120; location, 120-121; basis, needs, 121-122; programming, 122-123; educational role, 123-125; contemporary views (1990s), 177-180. See also Adult education; Vocational (occupational, technical) education

Contact hours. See Weekly Student Contact Hours; Workload (faculty)

Continuing education. See Adult education; Community education, services

Contra Costa Junior College District, 48

Contracts. See Collective bargaining

Counseling, 3, 120

Credit hours, 40-41. See also Workload (faculty)

Cunniggin, Merriman, 124

Cuyahoga Community College (Ohio), 90, 91, 92, 95, 113

D

Danforth Foundation, 124

Delaware Technical and Community College, 165

Demographics. See Age; Zero population growth

Department chair: role in improving instruction, 69-76; contemporary views (1990s), 164-166

Detroit, 121

Developmental education: and enrollments, 7, 10, 21-22, 93-94; and scholarship standards, 17; types, 89-91; impact, 94-95; and transfer education, 109-110; contemporary views (1990s), 170-174

Disadvantaged students. See Developmental education

District of Columbia, 121

Dixon v. Alabama, 142-143

Dress regulations, 146

Due process, procedural, and student activism, 140-143

E

El Camino College (California), 146

English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, 88, 171, 172

Enrollments, 1-28; demographics, 4-6; explaining, 7-15; stratagems, artifices, 15-18; conclusions about (1975), 18-22; contemporary views (1990s), 152-155. See also Age; Developmental education; Full-time student equivalents; Part-time students; Transfer programs; Vocational (occupational, technical) education

Equal pay for equal work, 64

Erie Community College (New York), 56

European Community, 157

Everett Junior College (Washington), 106

F

Faculty. See Department Chair; Instruction; Part-time faculty; Workload (faculty)

Faculty Association of the California Community Colleges (FACCC), 63

Fashion Institute of Technology (New York), 42-43

Fees. See Tuition

Finance: and enrollments, 7, 13-15; critical decade (1970s), 29-38; sources, 31-32; and public policy, 32-34; and changes in instruction and management, 34-35; and no-campus experiments, 35; private colleges, 35-36; prospects, 36-37; and transfer education, 114; community services, 119-120; contemporary views (1990s), 155-157. See also Part-time faculty; Tuition

Finger Lakes, Community College of the, 95

Flathead County (Montana), 121

Florida: enrollments, 1, 2, 7, 14, 17; developmental programs, 93, 172; upper division colleges, 99; transfer programs, 101, 103-104, 106; age of students, 111; growth rate, 153; faculty contracts, 160

Florida Junior College, 91

Free Speech Movement (F.S.M.), 130-131

Filthy Speech Movement (F.S.M.), 141

Full-time student equivalents (FTE, FTSE), 2, 3,10, 14, 20, 41

G

Gardner, J., 136
General Educational Development (GED), 90, 94, 171
Generation gap, 129
G. I. Bill, 9-10
Goldberg v. Regents of the University of California, 141-142, 143

H

Handicapped students. See Developmental education
Hawaii, 7, 12, 103
Henry Ford Community College (Michigan), 49, 56
Higher Education Act (1965), 119, 126
Hutchinson Community Junior College (Kansas), 58

I

Illinois: enrollments, 2, 7, 14; faculty workloads, 42; part-time faculty, 54, 57, 58; developmental programs, 93; upper division colleges, 99; transfer programs, 101, 103; community education, 109; growth rate, 153; collective bargaining, 159; faculty pay, 162
Immigration: enrollments and, 7, 21, 153
In loco parentis: and faculty workloads, 39, 44-45, 49; and student activism, 137, 141, 143, 181
Independent (private) two-year colleges, 9, 33, 35-36
Indiana, 6
Institute of Lifetime Learning, 123
Instruction: quality, quantity, faculty workloads and, 39, 43-44, 45; improving, 69-76; contemporary views (1990s), 164-166
Iowa, 7, 12, 13, 94, 101, 103
Ivory-tower stereotypes, 121

J

Johnson, Lyndon Baines, 31

K

Kansas City Junior College, 106
Kansas City (Missouri), 16
Kellogg Foundation, W. W., 177-178
Kerr, Clark, 131

L

Liberal arts and sciences programs. See Transfer programs
Literacy, 3, 15, 174. See also Adult basic education; Developmental education
Los Angeles Board of Education, 84-85
Los Angeles Community College District, 8, 12
Los Angeles Harbor College, 147
Los Medanos College, 173
Louisiana, 13
Lyceum movement, 125

M

Macomb County Community College (Michigan), 54, 56
Marketing and selling techniques, 3, 6, 15-16
Marland, Sidney P., 79
Maryland, 11, 56, 57-58
Massachusetts, 103
Medicare effect, 33
Melting-pot notion, 135
Mexican-Americans. See Minorities
Michigan: enrollments, 1, 2, 11; faculty workloads, 49, 159; part-time faculty, 56; vocational education, 80; contracts, 160; developmental education, 173
Minnesota Junior College, 56
Minorities, 7, 10, 91, 113; and student activism, 131, 132, 134-136; in teaching, administration, 133, 147, 181
Mississippi, 103
Moonlighting (faculty), 44-45, 49
Moraine Valley College (Illinois), 49
Morrisett, Lloyd N., 42

N

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), 113

206

National Education Association (NEA), 16, 55
Nebraska, 12, 13
Nelson-Denny Reading Test, 91
Nevada, 103
New Jersey, 14, 101, 104
New Left (the), 135, 140
New Mexico, 13
New York (City), 63, 101, 135
New York (State), 2, 7, 42-43, 49, 102, 114, 153, 159
Nixon, Richard Milhous, 31, 32, 36
North Carolina State University, 178

O

Oakland Community College (Michigan), 56
Occupational education. See Vocational (occupational, technical) education
Ohio, 13, 153
Oklahoma, 80
Onondaga College (New York), 42-43
Open door/open access policy: and enrollments, 7-10; and improving instruction, 70; and transfer education, 105, 175-176; contemporary views (1990s), 151, 176, 182. See also Finance; Tuition
Orange Coast (California) College, 49
Oregon, 16, 101, 103, 160

P

Palomar College (California), 144-145
Parietal policies: and faculty workloads, 39, 44-45, 49; and student activism, 137, 141, 143
Part-time faculty: ambiguity of, 51-54; workloads, 54-55, 63; number, 55; controlling, 56-57; sources, 57-59; qualifications, 59-60; wage rates, 60-62, 162-164; summary (1975), 62-64; contemporary views (1990s), 161-164
Part-time students: enrollments of, 2, 5, 10-11; and transfer programs, 106-107, 111
Pasadena City College, 42
Peace benefits, 126
Pennsylvania, 160
Pennsylvania State University, 13
Peralta Junior College District (California), 146
Philadelphia, Community College of, 91
Pierce College (California), 138
Pine Manor Junior College (Massachusetts), 146
Pitzer College (Claremont, California), 138
Population factors. See Age; Zero population growth
Pre-transfer programs, 90, 94, 170, 174. See also Transfer programs
Private (independent) two-year colleges, 9, 33, 35-36
Proximity, commuting, 7-8, 153

Q

Quality versus quantity (of instruction). See Instruction; Workloads (faculty)

R

Reagan, Ronald, 131, 132
Reclassification (or transfer) of institutions, 11-13
Reduction in Force (RIF), 2, 19
Rehabilitation Act (1973), 92, 94, 171
Remedial programs. See Developmental education
Revenue-sharing, 36
Rockland Community College (New York), 171-172

S

St. Petersburg College (Florida), 123
Satellite campuses, 8, 35
Scholarship standards, 17. See also Transfer programs
Schwartz, Edward, 135
Selling and marketing techniques, 3, 6, 15-16
Senior institutions, competition from, 15, 110
Shanker, Albert, 16
Shelby State Community College (Memphis), 172
South Carolina, 13, 176
Southeastern Community College (N.C.), 92, 171
Staten Island Community College, 91, 99

States, financing by. See Finance
Students: competition for, 15, 110; and community services, 122-123; government by, 136-138; participation in college government, 137-139; rights of, 139. See also Activism; Age; Developmental programs; Enrollments; Finance; Part-time students
Students for a Democratic Society (S.D.S.), 131, 134, 135, 140

T

Teaching, quality of. See Workloads; Instruction
Technical education. See Vocational (occupational, technical) education
Television (video) technologies, 8; and faculty workloads, 46-47, 48-49
Texas, 2, 102, 153, 159, 169, 171, 173
Transfer (or reclassification) of institutions, 11-13
Transfer programs: and competition for students, 15, 110; decline of, 99-118; definitions, 100-102; enrollments, 102-104; and vocational education, 102, 108; to four-year colleges, universities, 104-105; national studies, 105; college, state studies, 106; summary (1979), 106-107; causes of decline, 107-111; and community education, 109; and remedial education, 109-110; and part-time students, 111; and age of students, 111; current status (1979), 111-113; future, 114-115; contemporary views (1990s), 175-177. See also Pre-transfer programs
Trow, Martin, 134
Tuition (fees): enrollments and low-cost, 7-10, 18; pro and con, 31; contemporary views (1990s), 155-157. See also Finance

U

Universities, competition from, 15, 110
Upper division colleges (Florida), 99
Utah, 159

V

Vermont, 8, 35
Vermont Community College, 121
Veterans, 9-10
Video. See Television (video) technologies
Virginia, 13
Vocational Education Act (1963), 166, 168
Vocational (occupational, technical) education: classification, 12; and enrollments, 13-15; financing, 30; new look (1973), 79-87; and transfer programs, 102, 108; contemporary view of (1990s), 166-169

W

Washington (State), 2, 7, 8, 35, 101, 107, 175
Washtenaw Community College (Michigan), 56
Waubonsee Community College (Illinois), 54
Wayne County Community College (Michigan), 121
Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH), 40-43, 47, 48, 49
Whatcom Community College (Washington), 8, 35, 121
Wisconsin, 11, 13, 56
Without walls or campuses (colleges), 8, 35, 120-121
Workload (faculty), 39-50; definitions, 40-41, 46; formulas, 42; since 1931, 42-43; quantitative measurement, 43-44; and parietal regulations, 44-45; and quality of instruction, 45; new technologies and, 46; summary, conclusion (1973), 47-48; contemporary views (1990s), 159-161. See also Collective bargaining; Part-time faculty

Z

Zero population growth, 3, 5, 18, 33
Zook, George, 155

208

The rise of the community college is a well-known fact in the history of American higher education. Data clearly demonstrate how popular community colleges have become. But who could have predicted that millions of individuals would turn to community colleges in order to enhance skills, increase knowledge, and better their chances of occupational success? And who could have anticipated the unique situation of the community college environment for faculty and administrators, and in terms of finances and curriculum? While John Lombardi can hardly be credited with anticipating the evolving influences on the community college, he certainly can—and should—be credited with understanding the effects of these influences to an extent unparalleled by any other individual.

Perspectives on the Community College, a compilation of ten essays written by John Lombardi, provides important insights into the community college world. Although some of the essays were written and published up to 20 years ago, they have retained their value. In fact, many of Lombardi's remarks remain true to this day. More than ten years ago, he wrote that "improvement of instruction, next to finances, is our most serious issue." Certainly, this continues to be the case. He wrote, too, that "the melting pot notion...has not yet happened in the colleges." Given the recent evidence that it has not yet happened in society, it comes as no surprise that the colleges have not fully succeeded in effecting it.

continued on back flap

Essays included in the book address such issues as new student populations, finance, faculty, the role of the department chair, vocational and developmental education, transfer education, community service, and student activism. Though these issues are not unique to the community college, each is considered exclusively in the context of the community college environment. (This fact does not preclude the book from being a useful resource for individuals in the four-year sector, as well.) Contained in Lombardi's essays is plenty of food for thought. Though much has changed in the past 15 to 20 years, Lombardi's essays reveal that much remains the same. Arthur Cohen's concluding chapter provides a contemporary view of the issues addressed by Lombardi; his analysis indicates that many of the same issues continue to confront not only the community college, but also higher education as a whole.

This book is a valuable addition to contemporary literature on the community college. The convenience of having John Lombardi's most important essays compiled in a single volume, along with the added value of Arthur Cohen's contemporary analysis, makes this volume a "must have" for anyone concerned about the community college and the issues confronting it in the present day.

The material in this publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RI-88-062002. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. Government.

JOHN LOMBARDI'S involvement with the junior college movement began in 1936 at Los Angeles City College, where he proceeded to spend 30 years, first as an instructor, then as dean of various departments, and ultimately as director and president. Throughout his tenure there, and during his subsequent years as assistant superintendent of the Los Angeles Junior College District, Lombardi wrote continuously about junior college challenges and opportunities. After his retirement in 1968, he wrote under the auspices of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges until the early 1980's. Lombardi died in 1989.

ERIC

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

AACJC

ISBN 0-87117-240-2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE